The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XXXI • DECEMBER, 1945 • NUMBER 4

CONTEMPORARY SENATE DEBATE: A CASE STUDY

LIEUTENANT (jg) GIRAUD CHESTER, USNR

SENATE debate, a feature of the American government which our people once respected greatly, has sunk to a low level in popular esteem. Many present day observers relegate legislative debate to the political junk pile as time wasting, ineffective, and inferior. The visitor to the senate chamber, who sees the many empty chairs on the floor, frequently leaves with the same impression.

Are these attitudes justified? Is senate debate time wasting and ineffective? Is the quality of the speechmaking unduly low?

Questions such as these properly cannot be answered without considering the function of the Senate as a whole and the role that is assigned to debate in legislative procedure. Judgments based upon observation of behavior on the floor of the Senate itself without reference to the total functions of that body are misleading. This article is an effort to cast new light upon the much abused and much berated subject of senate debate.

My purposes are: (1) to describe the functions of senate debate; (2) to examine and analyze the speaking techniques used in contemporary senate debate; and (3) to evaluate the effectiveness of senate debate.

This article is founded on my master's thesis completed at the University of Wisconsin and uses the debate on the Selective Training and Service Bill of 1940 (S. 4164) for the specific subject of study.

The senate debate on S. 4164 took place in a complex international, national, parliamentary, and attitudinal setting. The debate began on August 9, 1940, and ended on August 28, 1940, covering 14 days and three nights of actual debate. During this time a series of massed air raids was made over Great Britain by the Nazi Luftwaffe, inflicting great damage and increasing the prospects of an imminent collapse of the island empire. This country was undertaking a general program of rearmament, of which S. 4164 was but one step. The division of political leaders into interventionists and noninterventionists in foreign policy became more acute during the summer of 1940, at the same time as the presidential campaign was moving into its early stages.

S. 4164 was prepared by a pressure group (The Military Training Camps Association) and was introduced into the Senate on June 20, 1940 by antiadministration Senator Edward R. Burke of Nebraska. The bill was referred to the Senate Military Affairs Committee which reported the bill to the Senate in an amended form on August 5. With the passage of the National Guard Mobilization bill on August 8, S. 4164 became the pending business and retained that

status until its passage in amended form on August 28, 1940, by a vote of 58-31.

There were wide cleavages in public opinion on the proposed legislation. But a large majority of the people, as determined by private polls, letters to the senators, newspaper opinion, expressions of pressure groups, and pronouncements of political leaders, were willing to accept selective training and service in peacetime if it was necessary for military preparedness. The populace was very much concerned with the fate of the bill and its attention was centered on Washington. Public opinion on S. 4164 stemmed more from the people's approach to foreign policy than from ideas of permanent military policy.

Both sides in the debate claimed "peace" as their objective. Both sides disclaimed any desire or intention of building up an American expeditionary force for overseas duty. They disagreed on whether conscription was democratic, whether the voluntary system had been satisfactory, whether a large conscript army was preferable to a small professional army, whether the selective service system would create more dangers than benefits, whether the voluntary system would produce the required number of men if certain alterations were made in the system.

The affirmative strategy was a carefully designed and carefully executed legislative plan. Its objective was to gain the approval of a majority of the senators for S. 4164 in the shortest possible time and with the fewest restrictive amendments. The affirmative leaders were majority leader Alben W. Barkley of Kentucky, as the representative of the administration; Senator Morris Sheppard of Texas, as Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee; and the official author of the bill, Senator Burke. This leadership synchronized the formal debate with the events in Europe, thereby capitalizing upon the responses of Congress to good and bad international news. During the debate, the affirmative strategy was to make few speeches and to keep these speeches as factual and as unemotional as possible. Much of their hope for a speedy and successful termination of the debate rested upon the anticipated endorsement of S. 4164 by Wendell Willkie in his August 17th acceptance speech of the Republican presidential nomination, but this endorsement failed to have the desired result. President Roosevelt came to the help of the affirmative with two press conference pleas for immediate approval of the bill, on August 23 and 27.

The strategy of the negative did not have this backlog of preparation nor this unity of purpose and leadership. The negative's objective was to defeat the bill or build up a record which would influence the House of Representatives to defeat or radically to amend the bill. Senator Burton K. Wheeler, isolationist Democrat from Montana, was the unofficial leader of the negative side, which drew its largest numerical support from the Republicans.

The Senate was in session 94½ hours during the two-and-a-half week debate. It is estimated that 76 of these hours were spent on the debate itself. Eighty-one Senators spoke on the pending measure, with Barkley and Wheeler speaking on 13 of the 14 days of discussion. Relevancy was maintained by far the greater part of the time. The level of the debate was properly judged by Barkley in a pre-vote statement:

> I wish to say that notwithstanding the long and hard fight over the bill, I appreciate the fact that, by and large, and for the greater part of the debate, with very rare exceptions, the senate has conducted the debate upon a very high plane. It has been an intelligent

debate. It has probably been a little longer than some of us would have preferred, but it has been a legitimate debate.[1]

During the course of the debate, 27 amendments were added to the bill. It is significant that the editor of the strongly interventionist *Nation* magazine, which called for a stronger conscription measure, wrote: "The act as passed by the senate was improved in many respects during debate."[2] The effect of the debate upon the votes of the Senators was extremely unusual, if not unique. When the debate began there was sufficient opposition in the Senate to make a major compromise necessary for the passage of the bill. The Maloney substitute, postponing the induction of men until January 1, 1941, attracted most of the compromise senators. Every indication points to the fact that if a vote had been taken on the Maloney proposal at any time before August 22, it would either have been adopted or the division would have been much closer than the 50-35 vote which obtained on August 28. Barkley may have been aware of this possibility because he carefully avoided pressing for a vote during the second week of debate. But Wheeler and the negative either were not cognizant of this development, or were unable to take advantage of it, or were out for bigger game. It is ironic that the negative should have been accused of prolonging the debate, when the extension of the debate was to its undoing. Although the nation's editors and critics were taking the Senate to task for slowing up the conscription program, *it is very likely that if the debate had not continued as long as it did, S. 4164 would have been severely compromised or, perhaps, have even failed of passage.* The longer the negative talked, the more votes it lost.

[1] *Congressional Record*, Aug. 21, 1940.
[2] Freda Kirchwey, "The Draft Debate," *Nation*, Sept. 8, 1940, p. 184.

Intensive analysis of the affirmative speeches of Senators Sheppard and Burke and of the negative speeches of George W. Norris and Burton Wheeler reveals highly specialized addresses, giving evidence of extensive study and thought on the subject matter. The speeches made during the course of the debate investigated all the ramifications of peacetime compulsory military training and service.

The senate debate compelled attention throughout the country. An examination of the content of 19 geographically distributed newspapers for the period from August 10 to August 29, 1940, revealed that the senate debate was front page news on 14 of these 20 days.[3] Twenty-five different photographs relating to the senate debate appeared in the newspapers surveyed. When it is considered that throughout the debate the competition for attention in the press was extremely keen, the publicity given to the senate debate was unusually impressive. But the influence of the senate debate was not limited to the publication of news and pictures. The debate was also instrumental in influencing and, in some cases, guiding the discussion and argument that appeared in the editorial columns of the newspapers. At least 89 editorials and 33 cartoons provoked by the debate appeared in the 19 newspapers during the period of study. The 18 syndicated columnists whose writings were pub-

[3] The following newspapers were examined:
Atlanta Constitution
(Butte) *Montana Standard*
Christian Science Monitor
(Denver) *Rocky Mt. News*
Detroit Free Press
Fargo Forum
Indianapolis News
Louisville Courier-Journal
New Orleans Times-Picayune
New York Times
Omaha World Herald
Pittsburgh Post-Gazette
Richmond Times-Dispatch
St. Louis Globe-Democrat
Salt Lake Tribune
San Francisco Chronicle
Seattle Post-Intelligencer
Washington Post
Wisconsin State Journal

lished in these papers wrote a total of 60 columns about the subject and character of the debate. Since the great majority of the newspapers in the country held editorial positions favoring the passage of S. 4164, the senate debate provided a period of time during which these papers could concurrently give voice to editorial opinion. In this way, prolongation of the debate served to arouse public opinion in favor of the bill.

In view of this evidence, it is clear that the senate debate on the Selective Training and Service Bill of 1940 was an important factor in forming and educating public opinion. The influence of the debate extended far beyond the chambers of congress. The Senators were, indeed, speaking to the nation.

General Conclusions

What are the functions of senate debate?

In a democracy there are numerous needs which have to be satisfied if the system is to function with maximum efficiency. Among these is the need for a forum in which grievances can be voiced and the energy of the executive checked or stimulated. There is a need for institutions which will wear off the sharp edges of special and selfish public opinions so that rival views can be accommodated to each other, so that demands of every group can be evaluated in the light of the claims of other groups and of the more inclusive public interest. Weak points in the demands of special groups need to be uncovered and plainly excessive claims rejected or reduced. Senate debate is an institution that functions to satisfy these needs.

Senate debate serves to clarify national issues. When we realize that the Senate is faced not only with plaintiffs petitioning changes, but with defendants protesting against the injury which will be done them by the proposed changes, it is evident why issues are fought out in the Senate. These debates act as a period of instruction for Senators who have not considered the problem and frequently bring to light new evidence which those who entered the debate with an opinion already formed had not considered.

Senate debate also serves to reconcile conflicting groups and policies by establishing a basis for those compromises without which democracy could not operate. Through the process of amendment, measures are often altered to satisfy minority requests.

Furthermore, senate debate acts to educate public opinion. It causes a salutary delay in the period between proposition and decision. It forces accountability into our governmental structure of separation of powers and divided responsibility by providing one place in our political system where faulty administration may be publicly exposed. Senate debate acts as a brake upon hasty legislation which can be gaveled through the House of Representatives.

What speaking techniques are used in contemporary senate debate?

The speaker-audience relationship peculiar to senate debate is the most essential difference between it and other forms of public debating. A speaker on the floor of the chamber speaks to several different audiences at the same time. He is addressing his fellow Senators who will cast the vote, the visitors in the galleries, the newspaper reporters who will carry his speech to the nation, the readers of the *Congressional Record*, who are usually the rival politicians and opponents of the senator, as well as research scholars and editors. The techniques of persuasion that a senator employs are chosen with an eye to the variety of appeals necessary to win approval from these different audiences.

Unusual features of senate debate are the running rebuttals and exchanges of remarks that play so great a part in each day's discussion. These are possible because of the freedom of discourse that prevails in the Senate. The techniques of speaking make for a high quality of debate when in the hands of competent Senators. It is the considered opinion of critical observers that the modern speaking techniques used in the Senate result in addresses which for the breadth of knowledge, careful reasoning, and technical skill that they exhibit, compare favorably with the best oratory of the nineteenth century.[4]

How effective is senate debate?

It is questionable whether a speaker in senate debate has much success in changing the vote of another Senator through direct persuasion on the floor of the chamber, but it is believed that by arousing public opinion in his favor, he can and does persuade other Senators indirectly. Senate debate is very effective in carrying out its functions as a national forum for grievances, as a clarifier of issues, as a force for accountability, and as a reconciler of conflicting groups.

To expect that debate within the chamber shall each day be on a superior level is an unfair and unwarranted expectation. An understanding of the duties and responsibilities of a Senator and of the demands made on his time by his constituents excuses occasional mediocrity in daily debate on passing matters. But it appears, from this study, that when an issue is important, when a major decision is to be made, senate debate is of a higher and more skilled nature than we would imagine if we based our judgment solely upon the usual cursory or partisan observation of our upper house in action.

[4] See Charles A. Beard, "In Defense of Congress," *American Mercury*, LV (1942), 529-535.

THE EARL OF CHESTERFIELD'S ADVICE ON SPEAKING

DONALD C. BRYANT
Washington University (Saint Louis)

A false accent or a mistaken syllable is enough, in the Parliament of any civilized nation, to assign to a man a certain degree of inferior standing forever.

AT THESE optimistic words of Ruskin's, written in the middle of the last century, we may raise a cynical eyebrow today. For the Earl of Chesterfield, living a century before Ruskin, however, they would have confirmed the most obvious of commonplaces; for as his philosophy of social behavior began and ended in the motto, "Sacrifice to the graces," so the epitome of his instruction to one who would be successful in public or private speech would be: "Engage the eyes by your address, air, and motions; soothe the ears by the elegancy and harmony of your diction."

Philip Dormer Stanhope, fourth earl of Chesterfield, it will be recalled, was the fulfillment of the eighteenth century's idea of a fine gentleman—rich, refined, cultured, restrained, capable in politics, brilliant in conversation, eloquent in public speech. A writer in the *Monthly Review* for April, 1774, said of him:

Few characters, among the nobility of this age, and nation, are better known than that of the late ingenious and witty earl of Chesterfield; who was alike distinguished in the polite, the political, and the learned circles. He was not, perhaps, what someone has

styled a "deep genius," but he certainly had a great portion of good sense, and lively parts; he had a perfect knowledge of mankind; he was a complete gentleman, and a delightful companion.

Today, however, the witty Earl is likely to be remembered only as the author of some slightly scandalous advice to an illegitimate son, as the object of one of Samuel Johnson's most devastating letters, or as the one whose name has become the designation for the height of polite manners. Perhaps for the long view, our current estimate is good enough, but even so, it must not be forgotten that the contemporary estimate of him quoted above was also fair and sound. By training, by experience, and by temperament, Chesterfield was a man eminently qualified to write those letters of advice and instruction to the three boys whom at one time or another he undertook, as far as was any way possible, to make into illustrious private gentlemen and public figures like himself.

Born in 1694, Chesterfield had the best of private and public educations at home, at Cambridge, and abroad, in the days of Queen Anne and the first George. The companions of his youth and young manhood were of the most notable—Lord Halifax, Addison, Lord Bolingbroke—and his experience in society and politics thorough. Member of the House of Commons from 1717 to 1726, he held many posts in the government and at Court; and for the years following his elevation to the House of Lords, his reputation as an able politician and administrator and an eloquent and effective debater was great. As a diplomat he made his name as Ambassador to the Hague in 1726 and as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland in 1744. As a parliamentary orator his two greatest accomplishments were his opposition to Walpole's Theatre Bill in 1737 and his campaign for reform of the calendar in 1751.

Chesterfield wrote no *Art of Rhetoric* nor had he the slightest notion that his advice on speaking would ever be preserved, much less printed. A considerable body of rhetorical principle and precept appears, however, if we draw together in some sort of order, the instruction he meted out, reiterated, amplified, and reviewed—to his son, his godson and heir, and the young Lord Huntingdon—over a period of upwards of thirty years. Most of Chesterfield's effort and love and care was devoted to trying to make his natural son into a gentleman, a diplomat, and an orator. The fact that this effort and love and care proved largely wasted detracts no whit from the interest and significance of the advice. Nor did it discourage the Earl from undertaking later the education of his godson, and the young Lord Huntingdon.

The education of the young speaker begins as soon as the child is capable of receiving directed impressions, for to Chesterfield as to Quintilian the education of the orator is the education of the whole man from childhood onwards. Specific instruction in speaking, however, seems to be delayed until the boys have reached seven or eight years. Then they are ready to have it first impressed upon them that in England particularly, no man rises to any real eminence or consequence except through eloquence. Especially, they are told, is this true in the world of politics and government, for which they are being prepared. There no man is great or successful who is not listened to eagerly in parliament. This is one of the recurring themes from first to last—that all things are possible to him who is eloquent, and that the rewards are all denied, no matter what a man's other talents, if he has not this one—eloquence. "Fix this in your mind," the Earl writes to his godson, "that no man can be considerable in this country, without distinguishing himself in one

or other House of Parliament."[1] And to his son:

> Let us return to Oratory, or the art of speaking well; which should never be entirely out of your thoughts, since it is so useful in every part of life, and so absolutely necessary in most. A man can make no figure without it, in Parliament, in the Church, or in the law; and even in common conversation, a man that has acquired an easy and habitual eloquence, who speaks properly and accurately, will have a great advantage over those who speak incorrectly or inelegantly.

It would constitute an extravagant use of space to quote letter by letter and year by year Chesterfield's insistent advice to the boy and the young man. The recurrent topics and the main emphasis of that instruction, however, may be illustrated adequately with typical quotations. One need only remind himself that each idea is impressed upon the youth again and again, some attempt being made to adapt the language of instruction and the illustrations used to the age and development of the boy.

What is this eloquence which is so vital to any sort of success? First of all, eloquence is the grand profession of Cicero and Demosthenes: "The two great Masters and Models of it were Demosthenes among the Greeks and Cicero among the Romans," the Earl writes to his godson; and among the earliest letters to the son, one in praise of Cicero is followed by one in praise of Demosthenes. These men are orators. To Philip Stanhope, the son, aged six, Chesterfield defines (in French) an orator as a man who discourses in a public assembly and speaks with eloquence; that is, one who reasons well, has a beautiful style, and chooses his words well. Later he expands that definition, taking a side thrust at the god-like Cicero. He writes:

> Cicero, conscious that he was at the top of his profession (for in his time eloquence was a profession), in order to set himself off, defines, in his treatise *de Oratore*, an orator to be such a man as never was, or never will be; and by this fallacious argument, says that he must know every art and science whatsoever, or how shall he speak upon them? But with submission to so great an authority, my definition of an orator is extremely different from, and, I believe, much truer than his. I call that man an orator who reasons justly, and expresses himself elegantly upon whatever subject he treats. . . . I humbly conceive, that a man may be a very fine speaker, and yet know nothing of geometry, algebra, chymistry, or anatomy. The subjects of parliamentary debate are subjects of common sense singly.[2]

This same definition Chesterfield repeats a month later:

> I hold him to be the completest orator who speaks the best upon the subject which occurs; whose happy choice of words, whose lively imagination, whose elocution and action adorn and grace his matter, at the same time that they excite the attention and engage the passions of his audience.

A letter or so further on the orator again is "a man of good common sense, who reasons justly, and expresses himself elegantly on that subject upon which he speaks."

There we have Chesterfield's oft recurring definition and description of an orator. The next question is: How may one become so accomplished a speaker? The answer is, by industry and application. As early as October, 1739, when the boy is scarce seven years old, his father begins impressing him with the fact—in Latin, in French, and in English—that though perhaps one may have to be born a poet (at least so far as invention goes), one may make himself an

[1] The best and most complete edition of Chesterfield's letters is Bonamy Dobree's (*The Letters of Philip Dormer Stanhope, 4th earl of Chesterfield*, 6 vols., London and New York, 1932). For convenience, however, I have quoted variously from the "Everyman" edition, *The Letters of the Earl of Chesterfield to his Son*, ed. Charles Strachey and Annette Caethrop, 2 vols., 1901, and *Letters of the Earl of Chesterfield to his Godson and Successor*, ed. The Earl of Carnarvon, 2nd ed., 1890.

[2] When it came to arguing for the change in the calendar, however, Chesterfield himself wished that he knew some algebra and astronomy.

orator. "Attention, reading, and work are sufficient to make an orator," writes the Earl; and this preliminary assertion is repeated, amplified, and illustrated again and again throughout the years, as, for example, two years later:

> By study and application, every man can make himself a pretty good orator; eloquence depending on observation and care. Every man, if he pleases, may choose good words instead of bad ones, may speak properly instead of improperly, may be clear and perspicuous in his recitals instead of dark and muddy; may have grace instead of awkwardness in his motions and gestures; and, in short, may be a very agreeable, instead of a very disagreeable speaker, if he will take care and pains. [Witness what Demosthenes did through care and pains.]

Here we have run pretty squarely into the main emphasis of Chesterfield's rhetorical teaching. Speak correctly, elegantly, properly, pleasantly; and the rest, more or less, will take care of itself. Oratory, to be sure, is "the art of speaking well," its business "to persuade people"; and Chesterfield's definition of the orator contains the requirements of "reasoning justly," and attending to "the more solid parts" of speaking. The burden of his teaching, however, is directed to the manner rather than the matter. He assumes that any boy educated under his direction and worth his trouble will have common sense, will have experience of men and of the world, and will know all that a man ought to know of history, politics, literature, and philosophy. His general education will provide him with the materials for his parliamentary speaking, for, says the Earl, all sensible men in parliament have the same matter for their speeches: the subjects of parliamentary debate are subjects of common sense alone. Evidently, too, a sense of order and management of ideas and of arguments will come naturally to the educated man, for the letters contain almost no mention of that phase of rhetoric. The expectation is that the youth will gain this sense of order and arrangement from his reading, for Cicero and Quintilian will have been his fare throughout his training. When he is seventeen, he finds in a letter: "You have read Quintilian, the best book in the world to form an orator; pray read Cicero *de Oratore,* the best book in the world to finish one." To the godson, aged eleven and a half, Chesterfield sent "an excellent collection of Cicero's thoughts on various subjects, the Latin on one side and the French on the other," with the note: "I have marked what he says upon eloquence, read it with attention."

From out of Chesterfield's own experience, dominated by Chesterfield's own devotion to the graces, however, comes the heart of the lessons in eloquence. The central theme is simple: gain your hearers' hearts and you have gained their favor, practically regardless of what their minds may say. Please them, therefore, with the dressing of your thoughts, and the elegancy and harmony of your speech, and appeal to their passions.

> I freely and truly own to you [he writes], without either vanity or false modesty, that whatever reputation I have acquired as a speaker, is more owing to my constant attention to my diction, than to my matter, which was necessarily just the same as other people's. When you come into Parliament, your reputation as a speaker will depend much more upon your words and your periods, than upon the subject. . . . The dressing . . . the matter well is what excites the attention and admiration of the audience. . . . The very first principle of an orator is to speak his own language particularly, with the utmost purity and elegance. . . . Constant experience has shown me, that great purity and elegance of style, with a graceful elocution, cover a multitude of faults in either a speaker or a writer. . . . Gain the heart or you gain nothing; the eyes and the ears are the only roads to the heart. Merit and knowledge will not gain hearts, though

they will secure them when gained. Pray have that truth ever in your mind. Engage the eyes by your address, air, and motions; soothe the ears by the elegancy and harmony of your diction; the heart will certainly follow; and the whole man or woman, will as certainly follow the heart.

This supreme elegancy, purity, and harmony of language may be gained by reading and observation. Read the best books and listen carefully to the best speakers. From the poets as well as the prose writers the ornaments of eloquence may be learned:

Though Poetry differs from oratory in many things, yet it makes use of the same figures of rhetoric; nay, it abounds in metaphors, similes, and allegories.

Translation is a third great way of improving one's style. Writes Chesterfield to the seventeen-year old son:

Translate and retranslate, from and to Latin, Greek, and English; make yourself a pure and elegant English style; it requires nothing but application. . . . For God's sake, make yourself an orator, which you can do.

But Young Stanhope, it seems, in spite of the best training, persisted in a fast, sloppy, muffled, semi-articulate speech. Hence the Earl's most repetitious admonitions concern that aspect of speaking.

Do not mistake me [he writes], and think I only mean that you should speak elegantly with regard to style and purity of language; but I mean, that you should deliver and pronounce what you say gracefully and distinctly; for which purpose, I will have you read, very loud, to Mr. Harte [the tutor], recite parts of orations, and speak passages of plays. For without a graceful and pleasing enunciation all your elegancy of style in speaking, is not worth one farthing.

Some people almost shut their mouths when they speak, and mutter so, that they are not understood; others speak so fast, and sputter that they are not to be understood either; some always speak as loud as if they were talking to deaf people, and others so low that one cannot hear them.

Thus the complaint against slovenly speech and bad enunciation goes on, and as often comes the cure: read aloud good authors, declaim, recite until you can please your tutor and your own ear.

When we see each other [writes the father], our principal topic of conversation will be, not only the purity but the elegancy of the English language, in both of which you are very deficient.

An agreeable and distinct elocution; without which nobody will hear you with pleasure; this everybody may acquire, who is not born with some imperfection in the organs of speech. You are not; and therefore it is wholly in your power. You need take much less pains for it than Demosthenes did.

A page and a half upon enunciation ends with an appeal to the highest authorities: "Read what Cicero and Quintilian say of enunciation and see what stress they lay upon it. "But if Cicero and Quintilian need supplementation, the Earl can cite Lord Bolingbroke who from the age of twelve strove for perfection of style and delivery, and Lord Chatham who for thirty years of his active life studied the art of speaking, more or less every day.

Had young Stanhope been less lumbering, less awkward, and naturally a more graceful and fluent speaker, the Earl's lectures on this subject would doubtless have been shorter and less frequent. There can be no doubt, however, that the central portion of his rhetorical theory was that which taught style and delivery. Any man of normal intelligence, he thought, could master the materials of speaking; but the art of pleasing discourse was another thing, to be learned separately, to be studied assiduously, for it is oratory, true eloquence. From his own experience, he drew a telling illustration of this point. When the consideration of the Gregorian Calendar was before the House of Lords, Lord Macclesfield, one of the great mathematicians of the age, advocated it fruit-

lessly in learned speeches. Chesterfield, however, who knew nothing of the subject, who had had to learn by rote from a master the language of astronomy and mathematics, carried the day for the measure because of the charm of his style and delivery. The House thought it understood him perfectly because he pleased it mightly.

Two more extended quotations from typical letters of Chesterfield will re-emphasize in conclusion the burden of his rhetorical teaching. The first was written in 1746 to the son, aged fourteen, and summarizes in due proportion Chesterfield's idea of the good speaker in action:

> [Demonsthenes is a good master. He took much pains for the graces of oratory, and he must have taken more for the] more solid parts of it. I am apt to think he applied himself extremely to the propriety, the purity, and the elegancy of his language; to the distribution of the parts of his oration; to the force of his arguments; to the strength of his proofs; and to the passions as well as the judgments of his audience. I fancy he began with an *exordium,* to gain the good opinion and the affections of his audience; that afterwards he stated the point in question, briefly, but clearly; that he then brought his proofs, afterwards his arguments, and that he concluded with a *peroratio,* in which he recapitulated the whole succinctly, enforced the strong parts, and artfully slipped over the weak ones; and at last made his strong push at the passions of his hearers. Whenever you would persuade or prevail, address yourself to the passions; it is by them that mankind is to be taken. . . . If you can once engage people's pride, love, pity, ambition (or whichever is their prevailing passion) on your side, you need not fear what their reason can do against you.

The second, written long after the bitter disappointment of the son's miserable failure in parliament, his undistinguished diplomatic career, and his early death, is addressed to the godson and heir, to be delivered after the Earl's death. It contains echoes of all the previous advice, and in addition some *obiter dicta* on parliamentary oratory and orators:

> You will doubtless soon after your return to England be a Member of one of the two Houses of Parliament; there you must take pains to distinguish yourself as a speaker. The task is not very hard if you have common sense, as I think you have, and a great deal more. The *Pedarii Senatores,* who were known only by their feet, and not by their heads, were always the objects of general contempt. If on your first, second or third attempt to speak, you should fail, or even stop short, from that trepidation and concern, which every modest man feels upon those occasions, do not be discouraged, but persevere; it will do at last. Where there is a certain fund of parts and knowledge, speaking is but a knack, which cannot fail of being acquired by frequent use. I must however add this caution, *never write down your speeches beforehand;* if you do you may perhaps be a declaimer, but will never be a debater. Prepare and digest your matter well in your own thoughts, and *Verba non invita sequentur.* But if you can properly introduce into your speech a shining declamatory period or two which the audience may carry home with them, like the favourite song of an opera, it will have a good effect. The late Lord Bolingbroke had accustomed himself so much to a florid eloquence even in his common conversation (which anybody with care may do) that his real *extempore* speeches seemed to be studied. Lord Mansfield was, in my opinion, the next to him in undeviating eloquence, but Mr. Pitt carried with him, unpremeditated, the strength of thunder, and the splendour of lightning. The best matter in the world, if ill dressed and ungracefully spoken, can never please. Conviction or conversion are equally out of the question in both Houses, but he will come the nearest to them who pleases the most. In that, as in everything else, sacrifice to the Graces. Be very modest in your *exordium,* and as strong as you can be in your *peroratio.*

Chesterfield's is probably as extreme and unqualified a statement as may be found of the commanding importance of manner above matter in rhetorical practice. Characteristic of the general temper of his time he certainly was, but

he was also more cynical than most of his contemporaries would have confessed to being. In any age, however, the *listener* tends to conform in his preferences to Chesterfield's pattern, though that listener may arm himself when need arises with auxiliary reasons for his choices.

SPEECH TRAINING AND SCHOLARSHIP*

CARL B. CONE
Louisiana State University

RECENTLY a distinguished historian delivered a series of lectures on our campus. His reputation as a scholar was beyond dispute. His writings had earned him the standing of an authority in his field. His lectures were well written; their content was a contribution to a particular phase of history. Yet the lectures were not well attended, with the exception of the first one, and in the small audiences there were few students, again with the exception of the first session.

In commenting about these lectures, a colleague of mine deplored the attitude the students and some of the faculty had taken. The general reaction of those who had attended the opening lecture was that the content may have been valuable, the speaker may have been an outstanding man in his profession, but he just could not put his material across. His voice was not loud enough, he read haltingly, his asides were stumbling, his emphasis was misplaced, he lacked force and failed to give the impression that he considered his subject the most important in the world.

My colleague maintained that the audience was in the wrong. He said that the listeners should give their attention to what was said, not to how it was said. He wondered if the reaction of the audience was a symptom of a diminishing intellectual activity. He pondered whether people are losing their capacity to concentrate and enjoy a lecture for its substance instead of its form. He then asserted that he believed this tendency to judge a speaker on his delivery, voice, and platform presentation rather than on the content of his speech was due, at least in part, to the speech training students receive today. Was it perhaps that students are being taught in their public speaking classes to confuse content and delivery, and to exaggerate the importance of manner of speaking to the neglect of the meaning of the speech or lecture?

Now this colleague is a good teacher and a clear speaker. He has no difficulty in holding the attention of students or in making clear what he wants to say. No personal lack of ability in speech-making prejudices his judgment upon the questionable influence of speech training.

My contentions were in opposition to the views of my colleague. While I conceded that the audience owed it to themselves to try to concentrate on the lecture and derive as much benefit from it as possible, I could not blame the audience for the opinions that developed about the speaker. My argument turned into a defense of speech training and its part in the training of a scholar.

I fear that too many reputed scholars are not clear speakers, and insofar as they do not read or speak well—clearly—

* EDITOR'S NOTE: Although the point of this article is doubtless familiar to most JOURNAL readers, they will probably enjoy its restatement by a scholar outside the field of speech.

they are not complete scholars. The opinion I am about to express can be only an opinion. I have no means of proving it, and my judgment, for what it is worth, is based only upon observation and experience, not scientific analysis or statistical substantiation. The opinion is this—the younger generation of college professors, say those under forty-five (just to draw the line somewhere), are, on the average, better speakers than the older generation of college professors, and because they are better speakers they can, other things being equal, in the end become better teachers and better scholars. Far from condemning speech training, therefore, I would include it as one of the necessary criteria of scholarship and effective teaching.

A university exists to serve two purposes above all—first, to perpetuate the knowledge that earlier generations have acquired and have handed down to us, secondly, to increase knowledge through research, experimentation, and dissemination. There are substantially three means of accomplishing the dissemination of knowledge: writing, speaking, and increasingly today, visual aids. A discussion of the latter will not be germane to my subject.

My colleague was enthusiastic about the lecturer's ability to write. The man does write well, and his books read well, and his facility with the pen has contributed to his reputation as a scholar. After all, a man's research activities, his hours in the library, must become known through publication before they can be said to have borne fruit. I think it is true that the ability to write clearly, although one is not a stylist, is an essential ingredient of scholarship. I think also that clear writing is generally accepted as a mark of a scholar.

Why should not the ability to speak clearly be just as essential a part of scholarship? Speaking is just as important a means of communication of ideas and knowledge as is writing. All too few historians, to single out my own field, can speak clearly and read a paper well. To ascertain this fact, attend an historical convention. If command of the written and spoken language is a prerequisite for the dissemination of knowledge, can a man be considered a true scholar if he he has not acquired a command, not to say mastery, of the tools of his craft?

If I understand the purpose of speech training and classes in public speaking, the emphasis is not laid upon old-fashioned elocution with its studied gesticulations and its florid attributes. The speech instructor strives primarily to teach his students to speak clearly, to articulate distinctly, to control the volume of his sounds, to place emphasis where it belongs. The students are supposed to learn how to speak and read so that their audiences can understand them without undue strain. Only then can an audience grasp the content of the spoken words. The necessity of concentrating merely to hear what is being said prevents an audience from concentrating on what is being said. The speech teacher does not underrate the importance of content. A good teacher of public speaking insists upon two things—the speaker must have something to say, and he must say it so that the audience can understand. In that sense, speech training is not a barrier to scholarship, nor does it countenance any effort to discourage the audience from devoting its attention to the meaning of the words. Speech training is not intended to teach the student how to conceal vacuity behind an imposing facade of fluency.

My conclusions are that good speaking is as essential as good writing in evaluating scholarship, that forceful, clear speech makes for better teaching, and that the scholar who seeks to dis-

seminate the results of his research must give consideration to his immediate, visible audience as well as to the unseen and unknown persons who later will read his books.

Some persons may be better endowed to speak well, just as some may be better endowed to write well. Writing can be improved through study and practice, and so can speaking. Too many historians, and other scholars as well, make no effort to do either. More of them ought to strive for improvement in audible communication. Have they forgotten their own student days?

A CASE STUDY OF DEWEY'S MINNEAPOLIS SPEECH

WAYNE N. THOMPSON
University of Missouri

ALTHOUGH looking backward upon public address permits historical perspective, observing the performance while it is occurring allows one to examine and to assess details often lost with the passing of time. Both accuracy and perspective are necessary for the highest type of rhetorical scholarship. The problem is to combine the two factors in a single study. The simple expedient of waiting, of course, makes perspective possible; the more serious problem of the two, therefore, is that of securing accurate and expert reporting of speeches *at the time that they are given.*

To meet this need, as great for the next generation of scholars as it is for ours, the Executive Council of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH formed the Committee on Contemporary Public Address, which has the dual responsibility of observing speechmaking as it occurs and of preserving such observations. Few who have worked in rhetorical criticism will question the need for these activities, for available reports of the speaking of the past tend to be weak at crucial points. Although newspaper accounts, letters, and reminiscences supply much helpful information and although they have a peculiar sort of value because they are lay reports, they lack the specific and penetrating comments that the trained observer *consciously writing a critique* can give.

The need is clear: Unless speech teachers everywhere observe public address and file copies of their observations in some central repository, scholars of 1995 will be but little better off than those of 1945. True enough, many recordings and sound movies will be available, but these, although very helpful, do not fulfill the same purpose as the written records of expert observers.

In these days of huge radio audiences, one such report is not enough, for in addition to a record of the speaking situation before the seen audience, scholars of the future will need reports of the impact of the speech upon listening groups far removed from the spot where the address was given. Here, too, the critiques of speech teachers should be preserved along with the observations of laymen.

The report that follows, therefore, illustrates two types of criticism, for both of which few case studies exist: (1) It examines the effectiveness of a contemporary public address. (2) It analyzes the effectiveness of a radio campaign speech. The report is in no way

a criticism of Mr. Dewey, of his political tenets, or of his 1944 campaign. Its purpose is simply to assess from a rhetorical standpoint the strength and the weakness of one of his major addresses.

Setting

Thomas E. Dewey, the Republican nominee for the Presidency, spoke before a Republican campaign rally at Minneapolis, Minnesota, Tuesday evening, October 24, 1944, before an audience of fourteen thousand who crowded the stadium and overflowed into the adjacent street. A nationwide radio network carried this address[1] to a far greater unseen audience. During the broadcast from 9:30 to 10:10 the writer was a member of a listening group of five persons,[2] who were seated in a comfortable living room. Listening conditions were almost ideal: Reception over WSPD, Toledo, was excellent and no noticeable distractions occurred; four of us were able to listen constantly, hearing every word within the limits imposed by fluctuating attention. Almost no conversation occurred while we listened. Preceding the broadcast, the conversation was on nonpolitical topics; consequently, as we began listening, we were subject only to residual, long-term prejudices.

Delivery

Excellent voice quality, comfortable rate, and smooth rhythm made Dewey's delivery almost perfect mechanically. Dewey's voice, a rich baritone of unusual flexibility, enlivened his words, giving energy and producing shades of meaning that are not readily apparent to one reading the text of the speech. This added force was especially noticeable in the instances of sarcasm and irony, but whether the biting quality that resulted helped the speaker is doubtful. With its richness and variety, the delivery, without question, was effective in building climaxes, in supplying emphasis, and in helping to hold attention.

Dewey's speaking, however, gave the impression of studied perfection, becoming an instrument of display rather than of communication. Lacking warmth, it was too formal for the radio. It raised a barrier between speaker and audience; Dewey failed to converse on intimate, friendly terms with each person sitting in the living room of a home. Finally, the delivery conveyed certain connotations of glibness and smugness—qualities which are discussed further under *ethos*.

Content

The purpose of this campaign speech was to regain the offensive on the foreign policy issue. In an address on this topic three nights before, President Roosevelt had spoken of the achievements of his administration, had attacked the Republicans as isolationists, and had accused Dewey of unfair tactics in selecting " a phrase here and half a phrase there."

Dewey divided his speech sharply into Introduction, Body, and Conclusion. The Introduction, which consisted large-

[1] For a text of the speech, see the *New York Times*, Oct. 25, 1944, p. 14.

[2] The listeners, three speech professors and two of their wives, represented various shadings of political opinion: Democratic, Republican, undecided. The writer is grateful to them for discussing the speech for some two hours and contributing many of the ideas herein stated. Differences of opinion upon some points, however, were sharp, and the views expressed in this critique are always those of the writer and only sometimes those of the other members. The writer is especially grateful to Professor Sidney Stone, who besides offering many helpful comments orally at the time prepared the following statement after reading this manuscript: "I am in agreement with your statement that Mr. Dewey's speaking 'gave the impression of studied perfection, becoming an instrument of display rather than of communication.' I felt myself listening to the vocal technique of the speaker with consequent detraction of attention from content. This impression of 'obvious art' was so strong that it tended to counteract the obviously good features of Dewey's radio voice. But radio's close-up of a speech adapted to a large immediate audience tends to force Mr. Dewey—and others—into a vocal delivery that is ineffective and even undesirable for radio.

"In general, I am in agreement with your analysis."

ly of compliments to the chairman, the governor of Minnesota, and to Comdr. Stassen, the former governor, was well adapted to the local situation but was of little interest to the radio audience. In a digression Dewey mentioned his farm policy, which he had planned to discuss on this occasion. He began the Body of the speech with a statement of what he stood for in foreign policy. Then he gave a rebuttal to Roosevelt's speech, saying (1) that it dealt too much with the past and too little with the future and (2) that it misrepresented the past. He devoted the major portion of the Body to an attack upon Roosevelt's record, thereby fulfilling the strategic purpose of gaining the offensive and of directing the attention of the public to the particular aspects of foreign policy in which Roosevelt had been weak. Dewey found opportunities, also, to repeat certain arguments common to most of his speeches—for instance, he attacked one-man rule.

The principal source of evidence was quotations from Roosevelt's speeches. The effectiveness of this device was lessened by the speaker's reputation for lifting such quotations from their context and twisting their meaning. (This factor reduced Dewey's ethical power, too.) The Republican candidate was more effective when using as evidence that portion of history which is common knowledge. For example, as one point in his condemnation of Roosevelt's foreign policy, he spoke of the President's permitting the sale of oil and scrap iron to Japan. A special type of evidence was testimonials from certain Republican leaders (White, Vandenberg, Austin, Taft, Wherry, and Martin), who said that they would cooperate with the White House if Dewey was elected. This material, related to the premise that cooperation between the President and Congress is essential for effective government,[3] although striking and valuable for its attention-holding power, was discounted by our listening group on the grounds that it was the testimony of prejudiced authorities speaking during a partisan campaign.

The strongest persuasive element in the speech was the attempt to energize the American hatred of Japan and to asociate that hatred with Roosevelt, who by permitting the sale of vital war supplies had assisted Japan against China. The attempt to tie the label of "isolationalists" on Roosevelt (an example of the use of the name-calling device), however, was less successful. Glittering generalities, especially those bringing the audience a message of hope and optimism, appeared less frequently than in some of Dewey's other speeches. A very effective persuasive device was the attempt of the candidate to associate himself with Comdr. Harold E. Stassen, whose wife sat on the platform. The support given by this former governor of Minnesota, whom liberals throughout the country respect, was in a sense refutatory, for another outstanding liberal, Senator Ball, who had been Stassen's campaign manager, less than forty-eight hours previously had announced that he would support Roosevelt.

Style and Rhetorical Devices[4]

Dewey's style, as compared with Roosevelt's, was formal and lacking in ease

[3] Is this Dewey's syllogism?

Cooperation between Congress and the President is essential for good government.

As President, I shall have the cooperation of Congress.

Therefore, my election will result in establishing a condition essential for good government.

[4] This section makes no effort to study style in the detailed, analytical fashion with which scholars commonly criticize the text of a speech, which they can read and reread. That sort of study, which has a value all its own, can be made by any future scholar. The purpose of the comments here is to indicate the effect of the style at the time of delivery and as combined with all other factors in the listening situation.

and colloquialism. Some of us thought this formality desirable, but others thought that it prevented good audience contact. The speech had several telling phrases, but, sounding either too studied or too malicious and bitter, they lost some of their effectiveness in delivery.

Early in the speech Dewey used restatement and repetition. The idea "These are chapters of the story that my opponent conveniently forgot" was used as a climax for each member in a series. One especially effective instance of dramatizing statistics was the statement, "The weight of that scrap iron alone was ten times the tonnage of the whole Japanese navy." An implied *a fortiori* occurred when the speaker charged that the President could not work even with the Congressmen of his own party. Although the argument was left here, the effect was no less than it would have been had Dewey added, "How much less likelihood is there that Roosevelt can work harmoniously with the next Congress, which will be Republican!"

Dewey made much use of sarcasm and irony. The Republicans in our listening group enjoyed these touches, but the Democrats and the independents thought that these devices weakened the speech. As contrasted with Roosevelt, who used the same techniques, Dewey was ineffective. The Republican's sarcasm had an ill-natured quality, whereas Roosevelt's was relieved by an underlying good humor and kindliness.

Audience Adaptation

The speech on the whole was poorly adapted to a radio audience. The first ten minutes of the thirty-five-minute broadcast consisted of applause and comments of interest to the people of Minnesota. Some members of our listening group disliked the applause and thought that Dewey should have come to the point sooner, but the slow beginning did not annoy others; no one, however, felt that the applause had any band-wagon value.

If Dewey's purpose in giving this campaign address was to sway the undecided voters in the radio audience rather than to deepen the enthusiasm of his Minneapolis supporters, the speech was designed poorly. It was obviously partisan; the ideas had been selected for a special purpose. The tone was such that an undecided voter would not feel that he and Dewey were engaged in a cooperative search for the truth. As one listener expressed the idea: "It is too much like old-fashioned debating; the object is not to solve anything, but to outwit an opponent."

The Conclusion of the speech was poorly adapted to the intimacy of the average radio listening situation. In what was actually a peroration Dewey became florid in style, piling up glittering generalities in a delivery that was distinctly noncommunicative. Of questionable value even for the seen audience of 1944, such speaking seems definitely out of place in a radio listening situation.

Ethos

The political predilections of the observer determined his reaction to the speaker as a man. Accordingly, the following factors reduced the ethical persuasiveness of Dewey, in the opinion of some of the listeners: (1) Too personal in nature, his attack dealt more with Roosevelt than with the issues. Although Roosevelt was in a sense an issue, the extensive use of *ad hominem* still resulted in a loss of ethical power. (2) Too much use of the first person singular gave the impression of egotism. (3) Overuse of sarcasm, rendered biting and nasty by the manner of delivery, made the speaker seem ill-tempered. Comments concerning the President such as "He made a speech, a very long speech" and "We had hoped

he would speak to the American people as grown-ups" were especially objectionable because they were not attached to any real argument. (4) A lack of fairness and generosity to his opponent gave the impression of smallness and narrowness. The attitude that there is nothing good in an opponent may appeal to partisans, but to independents it seems narrow, unfair, and even silly. The use of quotations from Roosevelt, a practice which might have been a source of strength, proved otherwise in this address, because each use of this technique reminded many listeners of the Democratic claim that Dewey in previous speeches had been guilty of misquoting. (5) The tendency to dismiss very complex problems with a quick flourish carried implications of shallowness or of insincerity. Dewey's positive platform for managing affairs and insuring peace occupied about one minute of the total speech. When coupled with this tendency to oversimplify, the smoothness and self-assurance of the delivery ceased to be desirable, but served to intensify the feeling that the speaker lacked a real grasp of the problems that he was discussing. Some members of our group, although unable to identify the precise causative factors involved, got an impression of smallness of mind and meanness of outlook that was more important in determining their reaction to the speech than anything that they could identify with certainty. (6) The delivery gave some listeners the impression of smugness and self-satisfaction. Seeming exhibitory rather than communicative, it failed to establish the speaker in a friendly, personal relationship with his radio audience.

Conclusion

Although not without its good points, the speech, in general, was ineffective whether judged by its persuasive power with the undecided voter or by the skill shown by the speaker in "discovering in the particular case what are the available means of persuasion." The speech was poorly adapted to the independent portion of the radio audience, and it was especially weak in ethical persuasion. It succeeded fairly well in shifting attention from Roosevelt's sub-issues of foreign policy to other sub-issues chosen by Dewey. Some striking facts and well turned phrases produced great impact at the moment of delivery, but the speech lacked wearing quality as the listener considered it more carefully. An undercurrent of smallness and unfairness was more significant, in the final evaluation, than anything said specifically.

For many of these shortcomings, Mr. Dewey was hardly responsible; rather he was a victim of a campaign custom of his age. To give a speech that is effective both with a seen audience of fourteen thousand cheering partisans and with an unseen audience of millions of groups of three or four persons, many of whom are politically undecided or hostile, may be an impossibility. Perhaps it would be better if candidates like Mr. Dewey gave two speeches—one, of the type considered here, for the local audience, and another, less partisan and formal, to the radio listeners.

LINCOLN THE WIT

W. A. DAHLBERG
University of Oregon

ALTHOUGH a wit is usually distinguished from a humorist as being less warm and sympathetic toward his fellowmen, no one has ever successfully separated the two. Mr. E. P. Whipple, a literary critic of the early nineteenth century, like many others, tried to draw a sharp line of distinction, but ultimately despaired. As a final rhetorical gesture, he added, "A wit would call 'A taskmaster the image of the devil carved in ivory,' whereas the humorist would look to the left and say, 'The negro is the image of God carved in ebony.'" The one delights in drawing a fleck of blood, the other sees the incongruities but does not wound. Or, stated another way, the wit laughs *at* you, the humorist laughs *with* you.

Invariably we have attributed to Lincoln the role of the humorist. His was the expansive soul—genial and good-natured—and I believe that most of us have thought of him in that light. The truth is that Lincoln, though a teller of homely stories, was also a master of wit, able and willing to ridicule out of existence the most cherished principles of the pro-slavery faction when ridicule seemed to be the most effective weapon to use. That he himself feared the use of it by others was shown in one of his letters:

> The game of the Democrats is to ridicule the Whigs out of existence. We remember how our militia was laughed to death. We remember one of the parades ourselves, at the head of which, on horse-back, figured our old friend, Gordon Abrams, with a pine-wood sword about nine feet long and a pasteboard cocked hat . . . about the length of an ox-yoke . . . and with spurs having rowels as large as the bottom of a tea-cup and shanks a foot and a half long. . . . Among the rules and regulations, no man was to wear more than five pounds of cod-fish for epaulets and no more than thirty yards of bologna sausage for a sash; and no two men were to dress alike and, if any two should dress alike, the one that dresses most alike was to be fined. . . . Flags they had, too, with devices and mottoes, one of which is, "We'll fight 'till we run and we'll run 'till we die."[1]

Some notion of Lincoln's attitude with respect to wit and humor as instruments of combat is found in his statement that, "It [wit and humor] answers the bitter question of the Pharisee with a parable and the yellow journal lie with a good story."[2] Or, "It is not the story itself that interests me, but rather its purpose for I use them so that the sharpness of a refusal or the edge of a rebuke may be blunted. . . ."[3] Again, "I learned much in noting how the institution of chivalry was ridiculed out of existence by its fictitious votary, Don Quixote."[4]

If one follows Lincoln's public and political addresses and debates all the way from his Sangamon speech which was delivered in March, 1832, to his last public address in April, 1865, one can see a steady use of purposive wit and, more interesting still, the fact that 50 per cent of his wit and sarcasm was at the expense of Judge Douglas, measured by actual count of humor and wit stimuli in all his significant political speeches and debates. For example, prior to his fifth debate with Douglas, Lincoln declared that the Judge had committed a fraud in the election of Mr. Harris and was attempting to commit another of like character, and then added:

> As the fisherman's wife, whose drowned

[1] Paul M. Angle, *New Letters and Papers of Lincoln* (1922), pp. 91-92.
[2] Henry S. Pritchett, *Scribner's*, LV (1914), 77-81.
[3] "Talks with Lincoln," *Century* (Feb. 1907), p. 502.
[4] Angle, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

husband was brought home with his body full of eels, said, when she was asked what was to be done with him, "Take the eels out and set him again!" So Harris and Douglas have shown a disposition to take the eels out of that state fraud by which they gained Harris's election and set the fraud again. . . .[5]

On another occasion when Douglas took credit for killing the Lecompton Constitution, although over 100 Republicans to 20 Democrats were responsible for its defeat, Lincoln, in his Springfield speech of July 17, 1858, asked:

> Does Douglas place his superior claim to credit on the ground that he performed a good act that was not expected of him? He says I have a proneness for quoting the Scripture. If I should do so now it occurs that he places himself upon the ground of the parable of the lost sheep which went astray upon the mountains and when the owner of the hundred sheep found the one that was lost and threw it upon his shoulders and came home rejoicing, it was said that there was more rejoicing over the one sheep that was lost and had been found than over the nine and ninety in the fiold. . . . "Verily, I say unto thee, there is more rejoicing in heaven over one sinner that repenteth than over nine and ninety just persons that need no repentance." . . . Let the Judge not say, "I am the only just person and you are the ninety-nine sinners."[6]

In that same speech he took occasion to remind the Democratic party members, who had hinted that Douglas was the man to overthrow slave domination, that "A living dog is better than a dead lion and Judge Douglas, if not a dead lion for this work, is, at least, a caged and toothless one."[7]

These utterances are not from the book of humor but are sharp and cutting bits of wit and ridicule. Note in the following instance, which occurred in Lincoln's speech of September 15, 1859, and which was delivered in Columbus, Ohio, how he resorts to ridicule and sarcasm in his efforts to discount Douglas's position on the issue of Popular Sovereignty. In that year Douglas contended that Popular Sovereignty should be exercised only where there would be 10,000 people or some other arbitrary number. Less than this, they would be considered only as individuals who wander upon the public domain in violation of law. Lincoln says:

> Popular Sovereignty pertains to people when they are formed into an organized political community and he [Douglas] fixes the minimum for that at ten thousand and the maximum at twenty thousand. Now, I would like to know what is to be done with the nine thousand? Are they to be treated . . . as wanderers upon the public land in violation of law? And, if so treated and driven out, at what point of time would there ever be ten thousand? If they were not driven out but remained there as trespassers . . . in violation of the law, can they establish slavery there? No, the Judge says that Popular Sovereignty doesn't pertain to them then. Can they exclude it then? No, Popular Sovereignty doesn't pertain to them then. I would like to know . . . what condition the people of the territory are in before they reach the number of ten thousand?[8]

Lincoln finally concludes by saying, "Judge Douglas is merely playing cuttlefish—a small species of fish that has no mode of defending himself when pursued except by throwing out a black fluid which makes the water so dark the enemy cannot see it, and thus escapes."[9]

At times it is a bit startling to note to what extremes Lincoln went with his wit and satirical jibe in his efforts to place Douglas and others in a silly and absurd position. In 1852 when General Scott said, "I accept the nomination WITH the resolutions annexed," Douglas publicly accused him of failing to take a definite stand. He held that such an acceptance could be interpreted in two

[5] Fifth Debate, Galesburg, Ill., Oct. 7, 1858. *Abraham Lincoln—Complete Works*, ed. John G. Nicolay and John Hay (1907), I, 444.
[6] Speech at Springfield, Ill., July 17, 1858. *Op. cit.*, I, 62.
[7] *Ibid.*
[8] Speech at Columbus, Ohio, Sept. 16, 1859. *Ibid.*, I, 545.
[9] *Ibid.*

ways. In the North it would mean: "I accept notwithstanding the platform"; "I accept though I defy the platform"; or "I accept though I spit upon the platform." In the South, his acceptance would be taken at its face value. Lincoln countered:

> Let us take from Douglas's ratification speech a sentence in relation to the Democratic platform: "WITH such a platform, and WITH such a ticket, a glorious victory awaits us." Now, according to the Judge's rule, his own sentence will permit of being read in each of the following ways:
>
> "Notwithstanding such a platform, and notwithstanding such a ticket, a glorious victory awaits us." "Although we defy such a platform, and although we defy such a ticket, a glorious victory awaits us." "Although we spit upon such a platform, and although we spit upon such a ticket, a glorious victory awaits us."[10]

Again he goes to the Scripture and concludes:

> Douglas says that the way the Whigs use the word WITH it can mean "notwithstanding," "although we defy," and "although we spit upon." Now take an example from an old and well known book not much suspected for its duplicity or equivocal language; which sentence is as follows: "And Enoch walked WITH God; and he was not for God took him. . . ." Now Douglas will hie away to the African church in Richmond, Virginia, and make a great speech, in which he will find great difficulty in understanding the meaning of the words, "Walked WITH God." He will show that it is and was designed to be susceptible of two constructions, one in the North and one in the South; that in the North the word WITH will read "notwithstanding," "although he defies," "although he spits upon." And finally he will thrill and electrify, and throw into spasms of ecstasy his African church auditors by suggesting that such monstrous duplicity could not have been conceived by Enoch or Moses but must have been dictated by General Scott.[11]

Here, there, everywhere, Lincoln, terrier fashion, tore at the Democrats with his satire and wit. In 1848 it was apparent that the New York Democrats were badly divided, a condition which they tried to hide in the interests of party morale. Lincoln called attention to their dilemma with a view to widening the breach:

> Their situation calls to mind a drunken fellow who once heard the reading of an indictment for hog stealing. The clerk read on till he got to and through the words, "did steal, take, and carry away ten boars, ten sows, ten shoats, and ten pigs," at which the drunkard exclaimed, "Well, by golly, that is the most equally divided gang of hogs I ever did hear of!" If there is any other gang of hogs more equally divided than the Democrats of New York are about this time, I have not heard of it.[12]

These thrusts, though largely at the expense of his most formidable adversary, Judge Douglas, were certainly not confined to him. General Cass felt the "witlash" in 1848 when, again, he sought reappointment to public office. That Mr. Cass had not been entirely honest in the expenditure of public money in the past was shown by the record which Lincoln called to the attention of the House:

> They [the accounts] show that he [Cass] not only did the labor of several men at the same time but that he often did it at several places at the same time many hundreds of miles apart. . . . And to eating, too, his capacities are shown to be quite wonderful. From October, 1821, to May, 1822, he ate ten rations a day here in Washington and nearly five dollars worth a day while on the road between places.[13]

Some years prior to this incident a Mr. Lamborn, speaking for himself and the Democrats, referred to them as men who, though vulnerable in the heel, were, nonetheless, sound in head and heart. Lincoln took him literally and rejoined:

> That they are vulnerable in the heel is

[10] Springfield Speech, Aug. 14-26, 1852. Angle, *op. cit.*, p. 92.
[11] *Ibid.*
[12] Speech in U. S. House, July 27, 1848. Nicolay and Hay, *op. cit.*, I, 147.
[13] *Ibid.*

literally true. Who but looks for a moment at their Swartouts, their Prices, their Harringtons . . . scampering away with public money to Texas, to Europe, and to every spot on the earth where a villain may hope to find refuge from justice can at all doubt that they are most distressingly affected in their heels with a species of "running itch."[14]

To have had a successful military career during Lincoln's time was an asset to anyone who aspired politically, and Lincoln was sorely pressed to protect himself and the country against the notion that, because a man had had military training he was, therefore, qualified for public office. One such favorite with the Democrats was General Cass, and often in their campaigns they spoke and wrote of his prowess and bravery as a soldier. On one occasion following such a campaign, Lincoln told this story before the House of Representatives:

> By the way, Mr. Speaker, did you know that I am a military hero, too? Yes, sir, in the days of the Black Hawk war I fought, bled, and came away. I was not at Stillman's defeat, but I was as near as Cass was to Hull's surrender. . . . I bent a musket pretty badly on one occasion. If Cass broke his sword, the idea is, he broke it in desperation; I bent the musket by accident. If General Cass . . . picked huckleberries, I guess I surpassed him in charges upon wild onions. If he was fighting Indians . . . I had a good many bloody struggles with mosquitoes.[15]

In his Kansas speech of 1852, he said of General Pierce, another Democratic aspirant:

> They [the Democrats] prepared a biographical sketch of Pierce in which he is represented at the age of seventeen to have spelled "B-U-T" for his father. Now I submit to you gentlemen whether there is not great cause to fear that on some occasion when General Scott suspects no danger, suddenly General Pierce will be discovered charging down upon him holding a huge roll of candy in one hand for a spy glass; with B-U-T labelled on some appropriate part of his body; with Abram's long pine sword cutting in the air at imaginary cannon balls, and calling out, "Boys, there's a game of ball for you," and over all the streaming flag, with the motto, "We'll fight 'til we faint, and I'll treat when it's over."[16]

Frequently, too, when he felt that he had successfully met the charges and accusations of the opposition, he would add, "And so the man recovered from the bite, the dog it was that died."

Lincoln was not alone the idealist and statesman. He could be and was a rough and rugged campaigner when fighting required ruggedness, and he was at all times thoroughly familiar with the game of politics and politicians. Time has mellowed and softened the character of the man, and we shall always remember him as the great Commoner, but the fact remains that in his time he accepted men and events as he found them—not as he would have liked them to be—and fought savagely for what he understood to be right. Perhaps we might in fairness say that as a *man* among men he was expansive, kindly, humorous, but that as a politician he was, among other things, the satirist and wit.

[14] Speech at Springfield, Ill., Dec. 20, 1839. *Ibid.*, I, 35.

[15] Speech in U. S. House, July 27, 1848. *Ibid.*, I, 142.

[16] Kansas Speech, Aug. 14-26, 1852. Angle, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

THE ILLUSTRATED SPEECH

L. H. MOUAT
San Bernardino Air Technical Service Command

THE use of visual aids in speechmaking is nothing new. The practice is recommended, especially for the speech that presents information, in nearly every current speech textbook. Techniques are suggested for the use of charts, film strips, training films, blackboard drawings, etc.; and cautions are stressed regarding position of lecturer, size and complexity of drawings, timing of presentation, and similar matters.

Rightly employed, visual aids serve their purpose well; understanding and acceptance are facilitated when two senses rather than one carry similar impressions. For the most part, however, visual aids are just that—*aids* to the expression of thought whether oral or written. Rarely have illustrations been utilized as an *integral* part of expression, wherein the purpose is accomplished by an artful blending of words and pictures in such a way that, although each is capable of expressing the meaning independently of the other, the impact of the two is very potent.

At San Bernardino Air Technical Service Command we have developed a method of speechmaking in which an illustrated outline is employed. This has been done by utilizing the talents of our course material and visual aids departments. The speaker, the copy writer, and the artist, together, produce the illustrated speech!

At first we were concerned only with the speech to *inform* for training purposes. Then, the Commanding Officer called on us to help him prepare a speech before a committee concerned with solving housing and wage adjustment problems—the speech to *convince*. Then came a series. An on-job training program, a "presenteeism" program, a new placement program—each was delivered to the audience concerned as an illustrated speech—not aimed to *persuade*. It is likely that we will celebrate the third anniversary of our installation with an illustrated speech to *impress!*

Nearby organizations became interested in our techniques, and today a huge reorganization project is being put across to top management of a San Diego aircraft plant in an illustrated speech series.

I

The illustrated speech is done with posters, 20 by 40 inches, hung on an easel, so that they can be easily flipped back as the speech progresses. On each poster (their number may vary from 20 to 80 or more) illustration and copy are integrated by adequate layout. The copy is usually a brief statement roughly equivalent to a subdivision of the speech outline. The wording is not so formalized, however, and often transitional phrases are included.

Because the speaker, copy writer, and artist create the illustrated speech as one team, there is no disharmony between the wording of the speech and the wording of the copy. Often the speaker utters the same words as appear on the poster. As often he does not. In either case, the poster is usually exposed *after* the point has been made; the copy becoming a sort of reinforcing echo. And this is why I call it the "illustrated speech" instead of another form of "visual aids." The unifying factor is actually the speech *dispositio*. It is on the pattern of presentation that the technicians *must* see eye to eye. The mode of expression often reveals individual differences.

The illustrations are bold, large, and

simple. The cartoon is by far the most effective type especially for negative ideas—what *not* to do. A cartoon, cleverly done, will leave an impression long after both copy and speaker are forgotten. But whether cartoon or straight drawing, simplicity is of the essence. Elimination of unnecessary detail is oftentimes as difficult for the artist as it is for the speaker, but it is necessary for the success of both.

II

Since it is not possible to reproduce an illustrated speech or even a part of one in this article, I will confine myself to describing a few sequences from several different speeches. Here is an extract from a speech selling our Placement Program to line supervisors.

CHART 4
Management is faced with some serious placement problems
(Drawing of a hand pointing to next chart.)

CHART 5
Employees misassigned in their present jobs
(Cartoon of 300-pound girl driving a scooter.)

CHART 6
Employees underassigned in their present jobs
(Cartoon of an executive type taking dictation.)

CHART 12
Here is a man with a background in social work
(Cartoon of man blowing little girls' noses.)

A lecture on parachute rigging consisted simply of a pattern of right versus wrong ways of doing things.

CHART 4
The harness should be adjusted comfortably
(Drawing emphasizing correct adjustment.)

CHART 5
Never like this!
(Cartoon of parachutist being strangled.)

CHART 42
Don't leave chute open on landing
(Cartoon of parachutist being dragged through cactus.)

A speech on personnel management used these charts at the opening.

CHART 1
There are three musts to good management
(No illustration.)

CHART 2
Homogeneity of assignment
(Cartoon of a secretary completely bewildered by the various types of jobs given her.)

CHART 3
Unity of command
(Cartoon of a scared clerk given contradictory orders simultaneously by two bosses.)

CHART 4
Delegation of authority and responsibility
(Cartoon of executive directing all activities of his organization by holding in his hand dozens of strings to each.)

III

A few implications suggest themselves. Here is where a speaker can have his outline before him—unashamed! He can impress his pattern on others with telling effect.

Three media can act as one—the spoken word, the written symbol, the drawing—reinforced with the "ethical proof" of the speaker, the stylistic quip of the copyist, and the imaginative stroke of the artist.

It's good theatre, if done well, and, as such, is heeded. Nowadays, few speakers get the undivided attention of their audience. The mental calibre of one or the other, apparently, is slipping. The movies seem to be the exception; witness Major Seversky's *Victory Through Airpower*. The illustrated speech contains the same ingredients.

It has been highly successful whenever

employed. And, more important, it has been employed in situations where speechmaking has been a relative stranger—within the walls of industry! Obviously, the speaker must be well selected and well trained. He should be able to accomplish his purpose without the use of visual aids, either as aids or as the speech complement. But, because rhetoric is "the faculty of discovering in the particular case what are the available means of persuasion" the speaker, in the instances described, missed none and was acclaimed accordingly.

MAJOR PUBLICATIONS OF GALES AND SEATON

ELIZABETH GREGORY McPHERSON
Library of Congress

IN AN appraisal of the achievements of Joseph Gales, Jr., and William W. Seaton as editors of the *National Intelligencer,* published in 1860, it was claimed that "their journal has done more than any other in the country to promote polite literature."[1] A tribute was also paid to them as compilers of the *American State Papers* in a recent article, in which it was stated that the series "represents, both as to scope and quality, not only the high-water-mark of historical publication up to the period of the Civil War, but perhaps for the entire history of the United States."[2]

So large a part have Gales and Seaton played in preserving the executive and legislative documents of the United States that the nation should have an interest in all aspects of the performance of their work. In this article it is impossible to do more than to make some condensed generalizations concerning their major memorabilia: the *National Intelligencer,* the *Register of Debates,* the *Annals of Congress,* and the *American State Papers.*

I

The *National Intelligencer* was the first important newspaper published in Washington. To trace the origin of this paper, it is necessary to go back to the journalist Joseph Gales, Sr., who had been driven out of England because he advocated parliamentary reform. In Philadelphia, where he arrived in 1795, he was first printer, later a reporter of the debates of Congress, and finally publisher and editor of the *Independent Gazetteer,* until he sold the paper to Samuel Harrison Smith before going to Raleigh, North Carolina, in 1799 to establish the *Register.* Shortly, thereafter, Smith preceded Congress to Washington, and on October 31, 1800, established a tri-weekly, the *National Intelligencer.* The admission of Smith as a reporter on the floor of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the publication of the utterances of both Houses in the *National Intelligencer* gave it a place of preeminence in American journalism.

In 1807 Joseph Gales, Jr., educated at the University of North Carolina, and trained by his father as a journalist and a reporter, was employed by Smith. In 1810, upon the retirement of Smith, young Gales became editor of the *National Intelligencer.* Two years later his brother-in-law, William W. Seaton, a trained journalist and also a reporter, joined him. Until 1820 they personally made daily reports of the debates of Congress. Gales sat in the Senate on the left

[1] "The National Intelligencer and Its Editors," *Atlantic Monthly,* VI (1860), 481.
[2] Clarence E. Carter, "The United States and Documentary Historical Publications," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review,* XXV (1938), 7.

of the President of that body while Seaton occupied a seat at the left of the Speaker of the House. According to tradition they shared snuff-boxes with those officers.[3] After 1820 Gales and Seaton only reported special debates of Congress, such as the Webster-Hayne debate, but they employed a competent and faithful corps of reporters to report the debates.[4]

For half a century the daily reports of the debates of Congress appeared in the *National Intelligencer;* and over a period of years other newspapers depended upon its columns for official news and for the publication of government documents.[5] For the sound and mild philosophy of the editorials, Gales is generally accredited, but it appears that Seaton wrote his share also, and that Daniel Webster was an occasional contributor and often an adviser.[6]

In as much as it was essential to please the subscribers to the *National Intelligencer,* the opinion of members of Congress could not be ignored. In general few members of Congress, except mercurial ones like John Randolph of Roanoke, complained about the inaccuracies in the reports of their speeches published in the *National Intelligencer.*[7] On January 23, 1818, Peter Force, for illustration, addressed a circular letter to each member of Congress, in which he announced his intention to launch a new publication, the *American Quarterly Review.* He also wrote to them for the purpose of ascertaining whether he could entirely rely upon the correction of "the Motions and Speeches," as reported from time to time in the *National Intelligencer* for inclusion in the proposed publication.[8] In reply to Force's letter, Alexander Smythe, a member of the House from Virginia, wrote: "I deem the reports in that paper essentially correct although there may be occasional typographical & perhaps verbal errors."[9] In a similar vein, John Forsyth, of Georgia, replied:

> The General character of the National Intelligencer is entirely correct whatever information it proposes to you is usually given accurately. There are occasional errors arising from a misconception of the tendency of the speeches & usually however of minor importance & scarcely worth the trouble of correction.[10]

Their opinion was borne out by an earlier statement of Langdon Cheves, of South Carolina:

> The speech of the Army I have compleated by prefixing the part which you had not taken down—I believe it is faithfully, and not literally reported—I have transcribed & altered a little in the phraseology that part which you sent me—
>
> My reply on the loan Bill & Bill for issuing Treasury notes I have returned with scarcely any alterations.[11]

Most of the annals of the early debates of Congress would never have been preserved but for the efforts of Gales and Seaton. A qualitative statement of appreciation of their work as reporters of the debates of Congress is perhaps best expressed by Alexander K. McClure in his *Recollections,* in which he stated that "they made the only reports of the debates in Congress that approached accuracy until official reporting became recognized as a necessity."[12]

A history of reporting the debates of

[3] "The National Intelligencer and Its Editors," *op. cit.,* VI, 480.

[4] *Ibid.,* VI, 480; *National Intelligencer* (Washington, D.C.), Nov. 27, 1833, Dec. 25, 1848, Sept. 3, 1853.

[5] *National Intelligencer,* May 3, 15, 1822.

[6] Frank Luther Mott, *American Journalism* (1941), pp. 178-179.

[7] *Annals of Congress* (1838-1856), *passim;* Elizabeth G. McPherson, "The History of Reporting the Debates and Proceedings of Congress," Doctor's dissertation, University of North Carolina (1940), Chap. I.

[8] Letter from Peter Force to Clifton Claggett, Jan. 23, 1818. *Papers of Peter Force,* Library of Congress.

[9] Letter from Alexander Smythe to Peter Force, Jan. 28, 1818. Force MSS.

[10] Letter from John Forsyth to Peter Force, Jan. 28, 1818. Force MSS.

[11] Letter from Langdon Cheves to Gales and Seaton, Apr. 3, 1813. *Papers of Gales and Seaton,* Library of Congress.

[12] A. K. McClure, *Colonel Alexander K. McClure's Recollections of Half a Century* (Salem, Mass., 1902), p. 38.

Congress may be divided into two distinct periods, the first extending from 1789 to 1850 for the House of Representatives and from 1795 to 1848 for the Senate. During this time the debates of both Houses were published as private ventures by enterprising reporters; and only running reports of the debates were made. In the second period, i.e., from the middle of the nineteenth century to the present, the debates, for the most part, have been reported verbatim. In the later era, after experimenting for over twenty years with the plan of subsidizing the press for reporting its utterances, Congress on March 3, 1873, voted to report and to publish officially its doings in the *Congressional Record*.

As editors of the *National Intelligencer*, Gales and Seaton were the logical compilers of the debates for the first period. Except the debates from 1789 to November 1800, much of the material had been published in the *National Intelligencer* concurrently with the session of Congress. That which was found too long for publication at the time that the debate occurred was preserved for future reference; nearly all of these had been taken down by Gales, Seaton, Smith, and their employees.[13]

Before Congress moved to Washington in the autumn of 1800, Thomas Lloyd, Thomas Carpenter, and James T. Callender attempted to publish some of the debates, but Congress refused to subscribe to their publications. Furthermore, reporters had been expelled from both Houses. In 1812 another effort was made to publish some of the debates without public support but the publication was soon discontinued. In 1818 Gales and Seaton proposed to collect and compile the debates from the First Congress, but Congress rejected their offer.[14] Until 1849 similar proposals met the same fate in both Houses of Congress.[15]

II

The election of Gales and Seaton as printers to Congress in 1819 made it possible for them later to begin the compilation of the debates in the *Register of Debates* (1825-1837), in thirty-nine volumes, covering the period from December 6, 1824, to October 16, 1837. As Gales and Seaton later explained, the work was begun "under the excitement of the fresh impulse given the National feeling by the visit of the great and good Lafayette to this country."[16] In the first volume of the *Register of Debates*, page one, is recorded an account of the nation's reception of Lafayette.

The purpose of the *Register of Debates* was to "supply a deficiency in our Political Annals which the Editors [had] long perceived, and which [had] been universally acknowledged and regretted by those who have mingled in public affairs."[17] Gales and Seaton carefully explained in the preface that in all cases the debates were not "literally reported, but their substantial accuracy may be relied upon."[18]

The original plan of Gales and Seaton was to publish the debates daily as is now done. This plan was satisfactory to most members of Congress.[19] After a week's trial, however, Gales and Seaton announced that it would be better to put the debates together at the end of each

[13] *National Intelligencer*, Jan. 17, Feb. 11, 1814; Apr. 23, 25, May 15, 1822; Jan. 28, Feb. 18, 1828; Jan. 30, Feb. 25, Mar. 15, 1832; Jan. 24, 1843; Dec. 25, 1848; Sept. 3, 1853.

[14] *Annals of Congress*, 15th Cong., 1st session, pp. 267, 1391, 1650-1651, 1663, 1680-1681; *American State Papers, Miscellaneous*, II (Washington, 1832-1861), 510; *Journal of the House of Representatives*, 15th Cong., 1st sess., p. 369. Hereafter this will be cited as *House Journal*.

[15] *National Intelligencer*, Jan. 24, 1843; Dec. 25, 1848; *Senate Journals, passim; House Journals, passim*.

[16] *National Intelligencer*, Jan. 24, 1843.

[17] *Register of Debates*, I (Washington, 1825-1937), Preface, i.

[18] *Ibid*.

[19] *National Intelligencer*, Jan. 8, 1825; Jan. 24, 1843.

session.[20] On September 24, 1825, the editors announced that the first volume of the *Register of Debates* was off the press.[21] The newspapers of the country made favorable comments, for example, the *Petersburg* (Va.) *Republican* considered it "one of the most important publications ever undertaken in the United States"; the *Boston Daily Advertiser* "regretted that it had not been undertaken much earlier"; and other newspapers were equally as laudatory.[22]

In order that the reports of the debates might be as polished and as accurate as possible, Gales and Seaton invited members of Congress to revise their speeches before they were published in the *Register of Debates*.[23] Most members complied; a few refused; and others responded somewhat reluctantly.[24] Although John Quincy Adams revised his remarks, in one instance he had a "strong suspicion that the debate would never be published."[25] Perhaps another reason for requesting members of Congress to revise their speeches was motivated by a desire to please them and thereby receive larger orders from Congress for the *Register of Debates*.

In compiling the *Register of Debates*, Gales and Seaton made no pretense of originality, but hoped that it would merit the claim of a "faithful History, free from the bias and prejudice or prepossessions, and from the accidental distortions to which all traditional accounts are liable."[26] The seventh and eighth volumes were "wholly compiled and prepared for the press" by Gales and Seaton personally and according to the *National Intelligencer* "every source where it was probable that authentic materials could be found for the work" was consulted.[27] They did not confine themselves to the *National Intelligencer*, but also perused the columns of the "Globe and Telegraph diligently, compared the various reports of every debate, invariably selecting that which appeared" to them to be the "fullest or more accurate and in all cases preferring that which bore evidence of the speaker's revision."[28] In making up the details, and in considering the work as a permanent and faithful record, Gales and Seaton "sought to do justice to every member of Congress, without favor or prejudice, personal or political," for they considered the "Register of Debates as a work of history," which will be transmitted "both to posterity, and will be referred to as authority."[29]

For political reasons the life of the *Register of Debates* was cut short. After the publication of the ninth volume, Congress refused to subscribe for the remainder of the series.[30] One reason given by the friends of President Jackson was that their remarks were frequently omitted. But the paramount factor seems to have been the defeat of Blair and Rives as printers to Congress in 1833 and the election of Gales and Seaton to that post. As a result, Blair and Rives began the publication of the *Congressional Globe*. This was published concurrently with the *Register of Debates* until 1837 when the latter was discontinued.

[20] *Ibid.*, Jan. 8, 1825.
[21] *Ibid.*, Sept. 24, 1825.
[22] *Ibid.*, Dec., 6, 1825.
[23] Letters to Gales and Seaton from Richard Rush, July 6, 1826; Nathaniel Silsbee, Apr. 27, 1827; and Asher Robbins, Mar. 28, 1833. *Gales and Seaton Papers*, Library of Congress; *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, ed. Charles Francis Adams (Boston 1856), IX, 211, 218; *Diary of John Quincy Adams*, ed. Allan Nevins (1929), p. 509; "The Autobiography of Martin Van Buren," ed. John C. Fitzpatrick, *Annual Report*, American Historical Association, 1918, II (Washington, 1920), 215, 219.
[24] *National Intelligencer*, Mar. 13, 1828; Adams, *Memoirs*, IX, 215, 218; Fitzpatrick, *op. cit.*, II, 215, 219.
[25] Adams, *Memoirs*, IX, 218.
[26] *Register of Debates*, I, Preface, i.
[27] *National Intelligencer*, Dec. 22, 1834.
[28] *Ibid.*, Dec. 22, 1834; *The Globe* (Washington, D.C.), Dec. 27, 30, 1834.
[29] *National Intelligencer*, Dec. 22, 1834.
[30] *Ibid.*, Jan. 24, 1843.

In the meantime, a lively political contest ensued between the editors of the *Congressional Globe* and of the *Register of Debates* and their friends. The followers of Jackson indulged in defamatory declamations in the halls of Congress concerning the *Register of Debates* and its editors. Often their remarks were inconsistent with orderly procedure of business of the day. Frequently, the most outspoken critics, such as Thomas Hart Benton, refused to revise their speeches before publication in the *Register of Debates*.[31] Unfortunately, there is no way to determine the accuracy of the debates printed in the two publications. A comparison of the number of speeches appearing in the two publications reveals that the *Register of Debates* included a larger number of speeches than the *Congressional Globe*.[32]

To the historian the *Register of Debates* is indispensable. It was the first non-newspaper publication of the debates of Congress that survived for an extended period. Its success inspired the publication of the *Congressional Globe* which included both the speeches and the proceedings of Congress. The knowledge gained in compiling the current debates for the *Register of Debates* may have also been a factor in initiating the compilation of the debates from the First Congress to the Eighteenth Congress, second session, published in the *Annals of Congress* (1834-1856) in forty-two volumes.

III

In January, 1818, Gales and Seaton sent to each member of Congress a circular letter in which they proposed to undertake to compile and to publish the debates of that body at an early date.[33] In the opinion of the committee to which their petition was submitted, "nothing could be more useful than a correct legislative history of the United States," but the plan was rejected by Congress. In 1822, in the House of Representatives, Henry A. Warfield proposed that Congress should establish a "journal of the debates to be published either daily or periodically."[34] According to Warfield's motion, the debates were to be reported by persons employed by the Speaker of the House for that purpose and printed under the direction of the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House. In an editorial in the *National Intelligencer* it was stated that:

> We are not aware of any reporters in this country, who would undertake so perilous a responsibility as that of making faultless reports; but there is no doubt that accomplished Stenographers might be obtained from abroad, who would undertake the task for the present, and educate persons to pursue hereafter. The plan might be carried into effect, we suppose, at an expense of a little more than twenty thousand dollars annually.
>
> For the newspapers the Debates have never been so fully reported as during the present session; this paper having reported nearly *five hundred columns*. . . .[35]

Unfortunately, the House defeated Warfield's resolution. It seems that the proposal to contract for reporting the

[31] *Register of Debates*, 23rd Cong., 2nd sess., pp. 26-27, 35. For instance, Benton, on December 18 and 20, 1834, pointed out that several of his speeches made in the Senate, especially on the bank issue, had been omitted or virtually suppressed from the *Register of Debates* while those of his opponents were fully and accurately reported. In fact, Jackson's and Benton's organ, *The Globe*, merely stated that Benton, on June 8, 1832, "after speaking a short time, he gave way to a motion of adjournment." The motion failed and then he is recorded as having spoken the second time on the bank question for three-quarters of an hour. The *United States' Telegraph*, another Washington paper, made no reference to Benton's speech. The only Washington newspaper to report Benton's speech was the *National Intelligencer*. Its report is printed verbatim in the *Register of Debates*. Complaints of others seem to have been without cause. *United States' Telegraph*, June 9, 11, 1832; *National Intelligencer*, June 9, 11, 1832; *The Globe*, June 9, 11, 1832, Dec. 27, 30, 1834; *Register of Debates*, 22nd Cong., 1st sess., pp. 1068, 1070-1071.

[32] McPherson, *op. cit.*, Chaps. III, IV.

[33] Letters from Gales and Seaton to James Madison, Jan. 26, 1818, July 29, 1833. *Papers of James Madison*, Library of Congress; *National Intelligencer*, Jan. 24, 1843.

[34] *House Journal*, 17th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 476, 542; *Annals of Congress*, 17th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 1778-1779.

[35] *National Intelligencer*, April 25, 1822.

debates in 1822 was defeated primarily because an expenditure of $20,000 for this purpose was considered a waste of public money.[36] At this time and even much later Gales and Seaton voiced opposition to the government's reporting the debates of Congress.[37]

As an experiment, in 1833, Joseph Gales, Sr., from newspapers, the journals of both Houses, and Thomas Lloyd's *Congressional Register,* compiled the debates of the First Congress in two volumes, which now comprise the first two volumes of the *Annals of Congress.* After their publication in 1834, the work was stopped abruptly, because it was too expensive an undertaking for an individual or a small corporation to finance.

The contemporaries of Gales and Seaton recognized the value of the publication of the running debates of the early Congresses, but Congress withheld aid for political reasons. Meanwhile, Justice Joseph Story, upon the receipt of the first two volumes of the *Annals of Congress* wrote Gales and Seaton:

> I have examined these volumes with great attention, and I am entirely satisfied with the plan and execution of them. I have for many years, deemed the publication of the debates in Congress, interwoven as they should be, and as they are in your plan, with the proceedings explanatory of them, one of the most important and valuable enterprises for public patronage. . . .[38]

Before Joseph Gales, Sr. died in 1841, he had compiled the debates of the Second and Third Congresses.[39] In 1843 Gales and Seaton again proposed to complete the series from the First Congress to the Eighteenth Congress, second session, but their political enemies were so strong that the bill was defeated.[40] The proposed terms for publication appeared in the *National Intelligencer,* January 24, 1843, as follows:

TERMS OF PUBLICATION

I. The History of Congress will compose an exact and true account of the Proceedings of both Houses of Congress on all public questions, with an impartial statement of all the Debates thereon, of which authentic reports can be found or obtained.

II. It will be published on Bourgeois type, in an octavo form, corresponding in size with that of the sample volume (of the First Congress) already published.

III. The period of each Congress will make a separate volume, with a distinct Index, if it be possible to comprise the Debates and Proceedings of a whole Congress in a single volume; comprising less than from seven to eight hundred pages each, with an Index running through the whole.

IV. The work will be divided by Congresses, as it shall be completed, bound in law binding, at Five dollars per volume; payment for which will be expected at the completion of each delivery.

Eventually Jackson's followers lost their control over the government. As a result, James K. Polk, in 1845, refused to accept the *Globe* as the administration organ. With the retirement of its editor, press and political opposition to Gales and Seaton became less violent.[41] Consequently, on March 3, 1849, by a joint resolution, Congress authorized the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House to contract for one thousand copies of the *Annals of Congress,* covering the first four Congresses.[42] The resolution also provided that the Joint Library Committee should "examine any further compilation of such debates and proceedings from the end of the Fourth Congress to the commencement of the Register of Debates." Each member of Congress was to receive one copy and the remainder was to be deposited at the Library of Congress for distribution. In accordance with the committee's report,

[36] George Grantham Bain, "Early Congressional Reporting," *The Phonographic Magazine,* VIII (Cincinnati, 1894), 171.

[37] *National Intelligencer,* Apr. 25, 29, May 15, 1822; Dec. 25, 1848.

[38] *National Intelligencer,* Jan. 24, 1843.

[39] *National Intelligencer,* Jan. 24, 1843.

[40] *Congressional Globe* (Washington, 1834-1873), 27th Cong., 3rd sess., pp. 355-359; *National Intelligencer,* Jan. 24, 1843.

[41] *National Intelligencer,* Dec. 25, 1848.

[42] *Congressional Globe,* 30th Cong., 2nd sess., pp. 615, 646.

Congress on September 30, 1850, voted to purchase two thousand copies of each complete set of the *Annals of Congress*.[43]

Gales and Seaton, continuing the work of Joseph Gales, Sr., compiled the debates of Congress from the Third Congress, second session, to the end of the series of the *Annals of Congress*.[44] From the files of newspapers, the journals, and stenographic reports, relics of by-gone days, they succeeded in weaving together a remarkably coherent story.[45]

For the period before Congress moved to Washington, i.e., 1789 to 1800, the task was more difficult. Even the leading newspapers in Philadelphia did not always print the daily proceedings of Congress. On November 18, 1794, the *Philadelphia Gazette*, edited by Andrew Brown, made a general explanation in regard to the briefness of the debates in its columns. Among other reasons given, the most important one was that "a certain portion only of a daily newspaper can be assigned to sketches of this kind; and hence much abbreviation is necessary. . . . The Editor has neither the time to *print* nor have the public time to *read* every word spoken." In further clarification the editor added that the debates of this date, "if taken *verbatim*, would fill more than twenty columns. The very sight of such a wilderness of words may deter any reader of ordinary courage from attempting a perusal. The only thing that remains is to make as few errors as possible; and when pointed out" correct them.[46]

For consultation, after Congress moved to Washington in the autumn of 1800, Gales and Seaton had the files of the *National Intelligencer* and their stenographic notes of the debates which could not be published at the time that the debate took place.[47] From necessity the "unimportant portion of the debates failed to be written out at length by the reporters for the lack of time."[48] In the *National Intelligencer*, May 15, 1822, Gales and Seaton explained that "we do not copy one eighth of what is reported to be said on the floor of Congress; and we hope we shall not be charged with breach of privilege when we declare that we publish more than *twice* as much as our readers wish to read." As an illustration, from their notes they wrote out and published, after an interval of forty years, a speech of John Randolph of Roanoke, delivered in the House of Representatives, January 12, 1813.[49]

Within a period of six years (1850-1856) Gales and Seaton compiled and published the remainder of the series of the *Annals of Congress*. In 1853, when they had completed the publication through the Twelfth Congress, they stated that "in this undertaking" they had "succeeded beyond their hopes."[50] Upon the completion of the work in 1856, Charles Folsom, Librarian of the Boston Athenaeum, wrote Gales that the *Annals of Congress* "will be one of your noble monuments."[51] In spite of the circumstances under which the debates of Congress were reported and compiled, today the *Annals of Congress* constitutes a much-used and an important historical source.

IV

The fourth important publication of Gales and Seaton was the *American State Papers*. When Duff Green was elected printer to Congress in 1829, that left Gales and Seaton with idle printing

[43] *Ibid.*, 31st Cong., 1st sess., pp. 1876, 1989, 2033, 2073.

[44] Frederic Hudson, *Journalism in the United States from 1690 to 1872* (1873), pp. 232-234; *National Intelligencer*, Jan. 24, 1843.

[45] Hudson, *op. cit.*, pp. 233-234.

[46] This debate was on the admission of James White as a territorial delegate from Tennessee.

[47] *National Intelligencer*, Jan. 17, Feb. 11, 1814; Jan. 24, 1843; Sept. 3, 1853; Hudson, *op. cit.*, pp. 233-234.

[48] *National Intelligencer*, Sept. 3, 1853.

[49] *National Intelligencer*, Sept. 3, 1853.

[50] *National Intelligencer*, Sept. 3, 1853.

[51] Letter from Charles Folsom to Gales, Nov. 29, 1856. Gales and Seaton MSS.

presses on their hands.[52] In Congress their friends tried to secure other government contracts for printing. Daniel Barringer, of North Carolina, proposed that the House of Representatives authorize the reprinting of the usual number of executive and legislative documents up to the Thirteenth Congress under the direction of the Clerk of that body, but the measure was still under consideration when Congress adjourned, March 3, 1829.[53]

After the inauguration of Andrew Jackson as President of the United States in 1829, he called a special session of the Senate. Still hoping to turn their idle printing presses to useful work, on March 10, 1829, Gales and Seaton proposed to publish:

. . . a compilation of the Executive Documents, and of such of the Legislative Documents on the Files of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States as are of public nature of date anterior to the Third Session of the Thirteenth Congress.

The value of a Work of this description will be obvious to those who reflect upon the magnitude of the interests to which the Documents relate, and advert to the fact, that, of some of them there is not a printed copy extant (the printed documents having been destroyed by the conflagration of the capitol in 1814) whilst the Manuscript Copies are subject to mutilation and destruction, from the necessity of constant reference to them for the most ordinary facts concerning National History and particularly the Legislative History of our country. . . . A proper National pride demands that they shall be rescued from oblivion.[54]

Because of the doubt whether it would be strictly proper to transact such business at a special session, the Senate did not act upon the proposition.[55] On January 11, 1830, Gales and Seaton petitioned Congress to authorize the publication of the usual number of copies of the *Register of Debates* and also the executive documents and the early debates of Congress to the commencement of the *Register of Debates*.[56]

In the meantime, others became interested in securing bids from Congress for the proposed publications. In the House of Representatives the petition of Gales and Seaton was referred to the Library Committee, which reported that the House did not have a complete set of its own documents and of "several sessions" there was not a copy.[57] As competitors of Gales and Seaton, William Greer, William A. Davis and Edmund De Krafft, of New York, and Duff Green, of Washington, submitted lower bids

[52] *National Intelligencer*, Feb. 4, 1830.

[53] *House Journal*, 20th Cong., 2nd sess., pp. 286, 298, 307, 324, 328, 339, 355, 385.

[54] *United States' Telegraph*, Jan. 28, 1830.

[55] *National Intelligencer*, Feb. 4, 1830; *House Journal*, 21st Cong., 1st sess., p. 158; *Senate Journal*, 20th Cong., 2nd sess., p. 201.

[56] *National Intelligencer*, Feb. 4, 1830; *United States' Telegraph*, Jan. 28, 1830; *House Journal*, 21st Cong., 1st sess. p. 158.

[57] *National Intelligencer*, Feb. 4, 1830. The report of the Clerk of the House includes a letter from Samuel Burch to M. St. Clair Clarke, Feb. 16, 1829, stating that the printed documents of the House, 1789 to 1814, were scarce and that "*original* manuscript documents from 1789 to 1801, were destroyed at the burning of the Capitol, in 1814, with the exception of a few from the Executive departments, which had been bound in large volumes." In further explanation the letter stated that it "often happened, that a document had been called for, which the office could not furnish, either in print or in manuscript." A summary of the holdings of the House documents made by the Clerk is as follows:

"Number of Octavo sets of Executive documents now in possession of the House of Representatives.

1st Congress	none	2d of 8th	1
2d do	do	1st of 9th	only 2 copies of 1st vol.
3d do	do	2d of 9th	2
1st Session 4th	do	1st of 10th	1
2d	1	2d of 10th	1
1st of 5th	1	1st of 11th	none
2d of do	8	2d of 11th	not a full set
3d of do	3	3d of 11th	1
1st of 6th	2	1st of 12th	3
2d of 6th	2	2d of 12th	not a full set
1st of 7th	2 copies of 3 vols. each	1st of 13th	none
2d of 7th	none	2d of 13th	3
1st of 8th	1	3d of 13th	7

Committee Reports Octavo Full Sets

1st Congress	none	2d of 8th	2
2d do	do	1st of 9th	1
3d do	do	2d of do	3
1st of 4th	do	1st of 10th	4
2d of do	2	2d of do	1
1st of 5th	none	1st of 11th	6
2d of 5th	do	2d of do	1
3d of do	3	3d of do	3
1st of 6th	2	1st of 12th	none
2d of 6th	2	2d of do	1
1st of 7th	1	1st of 13th	2
2d of 7th	2	2d of 13th	6
1st of 8th	1	3d of do	7

for publishing the executive documents.[58] Because Gales and Seaton proposed to include an index and to use of better paper and a more durable binding, the Senate accepted their bid.[59] Nevertheless, the *United States' Telegraph*, edited by Duff Green, sarcastically stated that "a bonus of *five hundred thousand* dollars is sufficient to ease all qualms of conscience."[60] The *National Journal* believed that the enterprise was of "national consequence, and deserved national patronage."[61]

Duff Green was determined that Gales and Seaton should not obtain the coveted contract. Consequently, on February 1, 1830, Felix Grundy, of Tennessee, introduced a resolution in the Senate whereby the Secretary of that body should be authorized to withhold the subscriptions until the appropriation bill should be approved by the House.[62] On May 17, 1830, Grundy's resolution passed.[63] On the same day, however, Levi Woodbury of the Library Committee reported a joint resolution favoring the publication of the executive documents.[64] By an act of March 2, 1831, Congress authorized Gales and Seaton to publish the executive documents in the *American State Papers*.[65]

Gales and Seaton were enterprising in collecting and publishing the executive documents. They were far better equipped to do the work than other printers in Washington.[66] Because of this the work was expedited and on January 4, 1832, Gales and Seaton transmitted to Congress the first two volumes of the *American State Papers*, namely, Volume I on *Finance* and Volume I on *Indian Affairs*, with a promise to have eight or ten more volumes finished by the end of the year.[67] So satisfactory was their work, that from time to time additional sums were appropriated by Congress until the project was completed in 1861.

The *American State Papers* (1832-1861), in thirty-eight volumes, was the first major documentary publication based on a general plan totally financed by the government of the United States. This publication, brought down to approximately 1832, was divided into ten series: Finance, Indian Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Public Lands, Commerce and Navigation, Naval Affairs, Military Affairs, Claims, Post Office, and Miscellaneous.

A comparison of the printed text with manuscript documents reveals inaccuracies in the *American State Papers*. Nevertheless, they remain the only comprehensive source today for executive and other documents printed therein from 1789 to approximately 1832. Included are documents that are no longer known to be extant. In spite of their defects, it is obvious that the accessibility and the

[58] *United States' Telegraph*, Jan. 28, 30, 1830; *National Intelligencer*, Feb. 4, 1830; *House Journal*, 21st Cong., 1st sess., p. 225.

[59] *Senate Journal*, 21st Cong., 1st sess., pp. 110, 113, 115; *United States' Telegraph*, Feb. 3, 1830; *National Intelligencer*, Feb. 4, 1830.

[60] *United States' Telegraph*, Feb. 3, 1830.

[61] *National Journal* (Washington, D.C.), Feb. 5, 1830.

[62] *National Journal*, Feb. 5, 1830; *Senate Journal*, 21st Cong., 1st sess., pp. 115, 123, 256, 309.

[63] *Senate Journal*, 21st Cong., 1st sess., p. 309.

[64] *Senate Journal*, 21st Cong., 1st sess. p. 309.

[65] *House Journal*, 21st Cong., 2d sess., pp. 350, 363, 368, 404, 409, 419.

[66] In January 1827, Gales and Seaton employed about one hundred persons and kept twelve printing presses running night and day. *Niles Register*, XXXI (Baltimore), 305. After a visit to their establishment in June, 1834, the editor of *Niles Register* stated:

"After the capitol and president's house, it is the most interesting object in Washington. There is nothing to compare with it in America—and few more extensive and efficient in Europe. The whole number of persons employed in this establishment was 165—including the bindery and folding departments, of whom about 35 are females, who are found very expert and faithful in handling the paper for the power presses, of which we think there are eight—viz: four steam presses, with a perpendicular pressure, which perform beautiful work, at the rate of about 500 sheets each per hour; three cylinder presses, whose operations are much more rapid, driven also by steam engine, and one cylinder press worked by man-power, in the turning of a large wheel. . . . There are besides a large number of the usual hand presses. . . ." *Niles Register*, XLVI, 298-299.

[67] *House Journal*, 22nd Cong., 1st sess., p. 145; *Senate Journal*, 22nd Cong., 1st sess., p. 56; Letter from Gales and Seaton, Jan. 4, 1832. Papers of the Senate of the United States. National Archives.

inclusion of material which has disappeared make the *American State Papers* a valuable source.

V

The United States government can point with just pride to the four major publications of Gales and Seaton, sponsored in part by Congress. The *National Intelligencer* was the only newspaper in which the debates of Congress appeared consistently for over half a century before official reporting became a reality. The *Annals of Congress* and the *Register of Debates* have been used by scholars and quoted to such an extent that the idea of their accuracy and reliability has imposed itself on the modern historian. Today both publications are generally quoted with no less confidence than is felt toward the *Congressional Record*. In spite of their defects both series have much of the dignity and formality of official records. For the practical workings of Congress, where references are often made to the past debates, these publications have served adequately, although they are neither verbatim nor official records. In fact, both publications have been so satisfactory for public needs that another compilation of the debates has never been undertaken or even seriously considered. In their sphere the *American State Papers* are also without a parallel. Obviously, each of the major publications of Gales and Seaton is a monument to them and also to the United States government which, sooner or later, sponsored or subscribed for copies.

RADIO AS ARTHUR HOPKINS PRESENTS IT

FLORA RHETA SCHREIBER
Brooklyn College

BACK in the twenties, when Arthur Hopkins was a new name on Broadway, radio still had its cat's whiskers against the crystal. In those days Hopkins, who thought much about the imaginative possibilities of the stage, never gave a thought to the rasping ineffectual toy with which a few mechanically-minded fans were tinkering. Then it would have seemed fantastic that the *Machinal* and *Anna Christie* which he was putting on the stage would find expression through this toy, become effectual as a dramatic medium.

But what might have seemed fantastic two decades ago was realized when Arthur Hopkins joined with the National Broadcasting Company for the presentation of Arthur Hopkins Presents, a program designed to establish a permanent repertory of one-hour radio re-creations of world drama for a people's audience. Such a program was the fulfillment, after two years' persuasion of the doubting Thomases on the various networks, of one of Mr. Hopkins' deep-seated desires.

I

His turning to radio was inevitable. Radio is the obvious way to reach a mass audience and from the first to reach such an audience was one of his aims. As long ago as February, 1918, writing in *Theatre Arts Monthly*, he characterized himself as "one who clings to the belief that the theatre can be a great agency for development—that it can greatly aid in the spread of culture and breeding and the growth of a sounder logic—that it can ultimately reach a place

where it helps mankind to a better human understanding, to a deeper social pity and to a wider tolerance of all that is life." He continued: "I am not one of those who believe there is no popular place in America for worthy drama. It is a taste that is cultivated, but cannot be cultivated until the people have repeated opportunities to respond to it."

Technically, too, Mr. Hopkins, who was always more interested in the suggestive power of ideas rather than their literal meaning, is at home in radio, for radio is essentially a nonliteral form. The absence of scenery puts the full emphasis on acting and writing—just where Hopkins, who regarded the proscenium as confining and properties as often mere encumbrances, wanted the stress to fall. The scenery of mood for which he strove (along with Robert Edmond Jones, notably in *Macbeth*) is created connotatively by music, sound, and word pictures. The Hopkins theory of unconscious projection—that theatre illusion, except for certain intellectual plays, is based entirely on an appeal to the "unconscious mind" of the audience—applies to radio as well as to the theatre. In fact, it applies to radio more forcefully. While the appeal of a play is to the unconscious mind, the play nevertheless is transmitted to the audience by objective means, by living actors in a tangible frame. The radio play, on the other hand, presenting in a stream of sound the imagined rather than the physical personality has no visible existence and, living wholly in the imagination of the listener, is a complete illusion. If the state induced in the theatre audience, as Hopkins always insisted, is one of hypnosis, is not the hypnosis even greater in radio, where the reality of the play rests in its connotative power, in its facility to stir the memories of the listener to give content and shape to words? If the stage director, as Hopkins maintained, must present every phase "so unobtrusively, so free from confusing gesture, movement and emphasis, that all passing action seems inevitable—so that the whole treatment, from the manuscript to the setting, to the actor's movement should be an easy flow, the base of illusionment of the audience," the radio director must do this to an even greater extent. For the moment there is a break in the action, the illusion snaps; and the listener, in the informality of his home, has no scruples about flicking the dial and calling a halt. The basis of theatre illusion is the synchronization of speech, gesture, and movement; the basis of radio illusion is a similar synchronization of speech, sound, music, and even of the pause, that signifies the unseen action.

To keep the illusion was the guiding principle, the compelling conviction behind the series. Just as the Mr. Hopkins of the theatre argued that properties are distracting and that they destroy theatre illusion, so, too, the Mr. Hopkins of radio argued that the radio play as generally written and produced offers serious distractions such as music and sound obtrusively handled. A particular distraction is the narrator, stepping out of the framework of action to talk directly to the audience and thereby breaking the spell of the play. Accordingly, Wyllis Cooper, the original adaptor, Wynn Wright, the National Production Manager of NBC, and Arthur Hopkins agreed from the first to place the main emphasis on the dialogue. They dropped the narrator, used a minimum of sound and music and meticulously preserved the essential impact of the original play. The series thus put its faith in the play and in the player—in the inherent rather than in the imposed value. The method was that of Toscanini rather than of

Stokowski; it was disarmingly simple, its importance lying more in what it repudiated than in what it innovated. In a nutshell, it was anti-literal, anti-blatant, anti-tricky. Above all it was pro-imaginative.

II

Commenting on some of the productions in the series—Thornton Wilder's *Our Town,* Tolstoy's *Redemption,* Clare Kummer's *A Successful Calamity,* O'Neill's *Anna Christie,* and *Ah, Wilderness,* Marc Connelly's *The Farmer Takes a Wife,* Sidney Howard's *The Late Christopher Bean* and *The Circle* of Somerset Maugham—Mr. Hopkins said in a statement to the writer:

> The two pillars on which dramatic productions stand are identical in theatre and radio. They are text and cast. If these are both right the result in either medium is certain. A good cast may help a weak play, but it will remain a weak play. On the other hand, many good plays have survived defective casting.
>
> If radio conveys the author's intent and flavor, it can surmount, and in some cases even benefit, by the absence of visual emphasis.
>
> So far I have encountered no radio obstruction to maintaining theatre illusion and magic. Our first eight plays covered a wide range of demands and I have yet to find any type of adult play that radio cannot fully convey.
>
> The benefits to the hearer who imagines the backgrounds and appearance of the characters are obvious.
>
> I do believe that there are personal emanations and mass reactions that no mechanical medium can convey, but for soul speaking to soul radio is a warm and stimulating medium.

Six of these plays were brilliantly realized, the two exceptions being *A Farmer Takes a Wife* and *A Successful Calamity.* The former is really only a partial exception, for it was well performed, particularly by June Walker and Edgar Stehli and it was well produced. What it lacked was vividness of scene and this lack is in the play itself, since its atmosphere is not connotatively created by its language. The failure of *A Successful Calamity,* on the other hand, was largely a matter of performance.

The best performances in Hopkin's radio plays came from Dudley Digges in *Ah, Wilderness,* Katherine Hepburn in *A Philadelphia Story* and Zita Johann in *Machinal.*

Brilliant though Dudley Digges and Katherine Hepburn were, however, it would have been even better to see them in these same roles in the theatre. For the voice alone is not equal to creating a complete comic effect. In comedy one misses the reinforcing gesture, flourish, or telling mannerism of the living, breathing performer.

In a play like *Anna Christie,* a psychological drama, one misses the presence of the performer considerably less. Here the voice alone can produce pretty nearly the full impact. This is so because the play has a trinity of elements that assures radio effectiveness. It has a sharp, well-calculated structure, cumulative emotional power, and diction which is both rhythmic and visual.

In plays like *Our Town,* a fantasy, free of scenery, ubiquitous, presenting death and life simultaneously, and *Machinal,* a tragedy, subjective, using stylized effects in the machine-like incisiveness of its opening dialogue, in its flashbacks and in its chorus, the presence of the performer is not missed at all. To the listener at the radio in the witching-hour quiet of his home, these plays are a completely fulfilling aesthetic experience.

Impressionistic plays, like *Our Town* and *Machinal,* are most suited to radio presentation for the self-evident reason that the radio play itself is essentially

impressionistic. It is impressionistic because of the particular psychology of the listener. The absence of visuality, as the defenders of radio drama have repeatedly pointed out, throws the listener back on his own imagination. There are, as with music lovers, two types of listeners to radio drama: those who see pictures and those who do not. Some listeners create living pictures to match the characters; for others it is enough that out of the flow of words they grasp meaning and emotion quite independent of picture. But in either case the listener is drawing heavily on his memory and he is subjectively investing the play with the color and texture of his own experience. Since there is no let up in the inevitable stream of words, he sees the play as a totality and is more concerned with the cumulative impression than with the detail. Since he listens in private, he listens with his defenses down and so enters directly into the life of the character. In his subjective mood, he has no difficulty in relating that life to his own. It is for this reason that impressionistic elements like the soliloquy, the inner monologue and the speaking chorus, at best accepted conventions in the theatre and bordering on the ridiculous unless delicately handled, come across in radio with complete naturalness as an intrinsic part of the whole effect. Take one illustration among many. In *Machinal* Zita Johann speaks aloud her nervous thoughts: "George H. Jones—he likes me—loves me—loves me not. . . . Well, my fine young lady how do you think we're going to live if you're too proud to work—is that the way to talk to your mother. . . . When he touches me, my blood runs cold. . . . Anything to get away from ma. . . . George H. Jones—Mrs. George H. Jones—Dear Madam." These thoughts of hers wander freely amid the hubbub of her office. When she speaks them in the theatre, she stays fixed in her world, while the audience looks on. But in radio she is separated from her environment and the listener enters her consciousness.

III

A willing ear-witness to the first of these programs, I became an eye as well as ear-witness at *Anna Christie*. I observed the play from the first moment of the reading rehearsal two o'clock one Monday afternoon right through its broadcast Wednesday (11:30-12:30 P.M. EWT), sixteen and one-half hours in all. The reading rehearsal, which was concerned entirely with interpretation, was no different from a stage reading rehearsal. Work on interpretation continued at the mike rehearsal, but as Pauline Lord, J. Edward Bromberg, Wendell Corey and the rest of the cast found their places at the microphone, as Wynn Wright, National Production Manager of NBC and director of the play, and Arthur Hopkins, took to the control room, one was fully aware that this was radio and not the stage, that there were special problems to be met.

Wynn Wright used two microphones instead of the more usual single microphone to assure as much flexibility of movement as radio would permit. This avoided crowding, made possible two groupings, and in some cases gave an actor approximately the same sense of entering a new scene or of crossing to a new position that he has in the theatre. The actors did not work close to the mike. It was unnecessary for them to do so because supersensitive microphones made possible greater projection than ordinary mikes. For an intimate effect the actors worked one foot away. At times a sense of space was required and then the full stage was used. In *The Farmer Takes a Wife* the chorus of singing men moved to the extreme up left of the stage and rendered the last lines offstage. In *Machinal* the minister walked

clear across the stage as he intoned. And now in *Anna Christie* Matt Burke arriving on the barge out of the shipwreck made his first entrance by walking diagonally across from the extreme up left of the stage to the mike down right, where he joined Anna for their first scene together.

The staging of the first meeting between Anna and Matt was much like the same scene in the original Broadway production. Where in the theatre Matt, a shadowy figure, climbed over the side of the barge and staggered out of the darkness into the light, in the radio production he was at first a voice in the distance and the voice came gradually closer, mumbling "Row, ye divil, row! Now, what's this here tub? Well, we're safe anyway, with the help o' God." In the theatre, Anna emerging from the cabin at the opposite side of the barge, came toward him and reached him just as he was about to fall. In the radio version, the same action was represented by Matt's saying "I'm bate out entirely," on mike, as he slumped to the deck and a door was opened. Now Anna entered the scene. In the theatre her first words were "Here you are. Here's a drink for you. You need it, I guess," while in the radio production she said, on-mike, "Who're y-oh" and called "One of 'em's out here, Father." In the former case Matt's confused reply to her opening words was "Is it dreaming I am?" and in the other "Is it dreamin' I am, then?" In the play Anna replied, "Drink it and you'll find it ain't no dream"; in the radio version, she said, "Here you are. Here's a drink for you. You need it, I guess." "To hell with the drink," says the Matt of the play, "—but I'll take it just the same. Ahah I'm needin' that—and 'tis fine stuff. But 'twasn't booze I meant when I said, was I dreamin'. I thought you was some mermaid out of the sea come to torment me." Matt in the radio version spoke very similarly: "Ay, I'm needin' it. 'Tis fine stuff. But 'twasn't the booze I was meanin' when I said was I dreamin'. I thought you was a mermaid come out o' the sea to torment me." From here on the dialogue of this first meeting proceeded identically in the theatre and on the radio.

In many instances the reading of a given line will be different in radio, where the voice must compensate for the lack of seen action, from what it would be in theatre, where action strengthens the import of the words. For example, when Anna asked the exhausted Matt to lie down and rest, he struggled to his feet in protest. The radio audience cannot actually see the struggle; the actor must suggest it by a change in voice quality to indicate the new position. Later in the same scene Matt said, "It's one of your kisses I'm needin' to take the tiredness out of my bones." Anna discouraged him. He was afraid that he had offended her and asked that they be friends. "Sure," she said. "Then shake hands on it," he urged. Since the handshake cannot be seen, all the heartiness supposed to be expressed in it must be conveyed in the voice. Elsewhere, Matt carried on a verbal battle and then an actual fight with Old Chris, Anna's father. "'Tis an Irishman you be needin' in your family—an Irishman and a man o' the stokehold," Matt taunted. Chris, who was about to strike him, had to convey the full menace of the attempt in the simple line, "You look out, you." Without noting the interruption Matt pushed his point, "And it's that you'll be having, whether you like it or not; for Anna and me'll be married this day, and no old fool the like of you'll stop us!" Chris whimpered, "You don't," prolonged it into a hurt cry, then, knife in hand, leapt at Matt, knocking the chair over as he did so, while Matt laughed, twisted the knife out of the old man's

hands and tossed it on the deck. Only two sounds of the fight were heard—first the chair and then the knife hitting the deck. These sounds were given meaning by Matt's reading of "Old men as getting childish shouldn't play with knives." And Matt had the last word. "I've half a mind to hit you a great clout would put sense into your squarehead. Now keep off me, I'm warning you." Matt had to read this line so as to convey the image of his shoving the old man off.

Even though only the voice can be heard, meticulously Wynn Wright painted the scene and the mood. In the opening scene, for instance, when a customer asked Larry, the barkeeper, what time it was, Mr. Wright told Larry to take time to look at the clock before answering. When Anna and Old Chris reminisced on the barge anchored in Provincetown harbor, Mr. Wright asked them to give the effect of talking easily while leaning over the rail. He called for a quality of night and of the open air.

Since radio actors must read lines, often standing static at a mike for long sequences of dialogue, function without costume or gesture and trust their "business" to the soundman, there is a real danger that there will be no rapport between them. The director, therefore, must make every effort to assure a free flow of performance. For this reason, although Mr. Wright regularly cued music and sound and an actor after a sound pattern, he preferred not to cue an actor after a pause. After Anna revealed that she had been a prostitute, Chris said, "Anna, it's a lie—it's a lie," and there was a long pause. When Wendell Corey, playing Matt, asked the director to cue him on the line that breaks the pause, Mr. Wright replied, "No, I'd rather you feel it." Mr. Wright worked to have the actors sharply motivate each other. Wendell Corey had to stress, "It's a hard and lonely life, the sea is. And the only women you meet in all the ports of the world be willin' to speak you a kind word ain't women at all. But you wouldn't know about that kind of women." The speech had to be stressed because, as the unknowing but nonetheless ironic reference to Anna's past, it motivates her nervous "I think—I guess I'd better see what's doing inside the cabin." And Mr. Corey had to be insistently tender and intimate in his "Don't turn your back on me now, and we beginning to be friends." And so, playing on her feelings, he worked his way into a proposal, breaking down her reserve and arousing Old Chris to his prophetic, frightened verbal assault on the old devil sea, the scapegoat of his own guilt.

This "old devil sea" theme runs through the play like a Wagnerian motif and out of it Mr. Wright built a thematic reverberation. Whenever J. Edward Bromberg spoke it, he faced away from the mike, thus isolating the motif and giving it distinctive sonority.

Sound effects were carefully selected to paint a place, establish a mood, or to further the action. Old Chris could enter the scene without the sound of a door to herald him, but Matt could not walk out on Anna, presumably forever, without the slamming of the door to underscore the finality of his going. "You've destroyed me this day and may you be awake in the long nights tormented with the thoughts of Matt Burke and the great wrong you've done him," Matt said, bitterly in parting. The door slammed. The slam heightened the poignancy of Anna's desolate, monosyllabic cry: "Matt."

But whether or not a director uses a great deal of sound, the soundman performs an important and indispensable function. He must have an infallible sense of timing, for there must be perfect synchronization between the "business"

he performs and the words the actor speaks. In the sense that he must characterize the action the soundman must himself be something of an actor. When, for instance, Matt returned to Anna after their stormy parting, the soundman whose job it was to characterize his approaching footsteps asked Mr. Corey what his mood was—was it vengeful, tragic, what?

Frequently, music in radio takes the place of lighting in the theatre. The last scene of *Machinal* is a good illustration of this. In the theatre, as the condemned woman uttered her dying wail and the priest intoned "Christ have mercy," the cyclorama, which was neutral throughout the play, became suffused with glowing colors. In the radio version it was music, specially composed by Morris Mamoursky, sneaking in unobtrusively at first, gradually swelling and mounting, sounding a celestial note as it reached its peak, that created the same effect.

Wynn Wright's technique was naturally an extension of the principle behind the program. But it was a happy circumstance that this technique is Mr. Wright's normal method. For, not overimpressed by the mechanistic face of the medium, he harnessed the mechanics to his dramatic purpose and pierced to its artistic heart. His collaboration with Arthur Hopkins was thus brilliantly harmonius.

IV

The collaboration was brilliant, the intention honorable, but no sponsor caught the enthusiasm and was willing to back the program. NBC itself, growing tired of unprofitable midnight highbrowism finally called a halt.

It is not easy to diagnose the reasons for the program's demise. Obvious, though, is the fact that the hour of presentation (11:30 P.M. to 12:30 P.M. for the Eastern Seaboard) was no time for building an audience. The Metropolitan Opera, the NBC Symphony, the New York Philharmonic could never have built a radio audience at this hour. Even today, with established followings, these programs would lose a large part of their audiences if their time were changed to 11:30 P.M.-12:30 P.M. Nor was the program's title, Arthur Hopkins Presents, meaningful to any but a handful of theatregoers. And it was the vast audience, many of whom had never seen a Broadway play, whom the program sought to reach.

As one listener who enjoyed the series and felt that it combined honest craftsmanship with creative insight, I should like to stress the basic soundness of the program's intention. It proved certain basic principles:

1. The effectiveness of *Machinal*, a tragedy, and of *Anna Christie*, a psychological drama, two genres radio has left untried, should be a spur to indigenous innovation along similar lines.

2. So, too, should the imaginative simplicity of the Hopkins-Wright technique be an example to radio directors, for it is a clear indication that when a production is stereotyped, the fault lies not in any fancied radio limitation but in a clay-footed approach to the medium. When a director refuses to be bound, the windmills of literalness crumble.

3. The program's emphasis on a maximum of self-expression for the actor, in terms both of interpretation and of physical movement, should be taken seriously. This emphasis can help to break down the automatism of much radio acting. A general application of this approach would raise the radio actor's regard for the possibilities of his craft, a craft which under present conditions he all too often despises.

To establish a permanent repertory of one-hour radio re-creations of world drama for a people's audience remains

a laudable intention. Laudable because the repertory idea is virtually untried in radio and repertory is important to radio's mature dramatic development. For only through repertory, through the frequent repetition of important plays can radio popularize the drama and cultivate dramatic taste. The field for such cultivation is virtually wide open. While radio in the last two decades did the American people a magnificent service in bringing them great music, it has brought them little of the world's great drama and that for the most part has been indifferently presented. Bringing the mature tradition of the theatre into the ephemeral world of radio and the popular pulse of radio to plays long languishing from disuse, a series like Arthur Hopkins Presents, suitably sponsored, aggressively promoted, and wisely presented in the early evening or on Sunday afternoon, could well be the reconnaissance thrust, the lead flight in helping to create a base for a people's theatre. In a small way "Arthur Hopkins Presents" may itself have stirred the first support for such a theatre among newly initiated or freshly awakened drama lovers.

Arthur Hopkins Presents did not succeed in the popular sense, but it did set a model for the sensitive presentation of adult drama.

FORMALISM AND ILLUSION IN SHAKESPEARIAN DRAMA 1595-1598

WILLIAM G. McCOLLOM
Western Reserve University

RECENT study of the theatrical art has been strongly influenced by the doctrine, stemming from Kant, that the aesthetic experience consists chiefly in the disinterested contemplation of pure form; or, as Herbart put it, in the apprehension of the "relations formed by a complexity of elements."[1] Writers on theatrical theory have insisted that representation and its companion, illusion, tend to degrade the theatre to the level of a peep show.[2] A similar spirit has affected the study of the dramatic literature of the Elizabethan age. In an effort to correct the seemingly unhistorical criticism of Lamb, Swinburne, and William Archer, all of whom assumed that the Elizabethan drama sought to create the illusion of reality, modern scholars remind us of the nonillusive structure of the Elizabethan playhouse, of the Elizabethan fondness for patterned speech, expository asides, and sermons in dramatic form.[3] Study seems to show that an Elizabethan play could not be illusive and that the productions were designed in frank recognition of this fact. And the scholars sometimes imply that in avoiding illusion the Elizabethans were embracing art.[4]

In the early decades of Elizabeth's reign the drama was indeed highly formalized. As late as 1590 a play was not so much a representation of an action as a kind of platform-oratory permitting

[1] *Practical Philosophy*, in *Philosophies of Beauty*, ed. E. F. Carritt (1931), p. 153.

[2] See Alexander Bakshy, *The Theatre Unbound* (London, 1923). Bakshy appeals to the authority of Kant (p. 72). See also Stark Young, "Illusion and Wonder," in *Theatre Practice* (1926), pp. 53-72.

[3] See Levin L. Schücking, *Character Problems in Shakespeare's Plays* (London, 1922), p. 29; M. C. Bradbrook, *Elizabethan Stage Conditions* (Cambridge, 1932), p. 119 and her *Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy* (Cambridge, 1935), *passim*; Henry Hitch Adams, *English Domestic or Homiletic Tragedy, 1575-1642* (1943), *passim*.

[4] Bradbrook, *Themes and Conventions*, p. 3; U.M. Ellis-Fermor, *The Jacobean Drama* (London, 1936), pp. 28 ff.

a few set types of characters to address the audience in long passages of ornamental rhetoric. The effect of plays like *The Misfortunes of Arthur, The Spanish Tragedy,* and *Titus Andronicus* is, so to speak, centrifugal rather than centripetal. There is comparatively little dramatic tension created by the interplay of character; for the persons in these tragedies seldom appear to be talking to one another or even to themselves.

In the mid-nineties, however, the drama began to swing from formalism to illusion, from platform-oratory to a representation of life calculated to lift the spectator into a realm independent of the theatre and its platform stage. The evolution is visible in the serious dramas written by Shakespeare during these years.

Between *Romeo and Juliet* and *Julius Caesar,* Shakespeare wrote the following dramas:[5]

Richard II, 1595
King John, 1596
The Merchant of Venice, 1596
I, II Henry IV, 1597
Henry V, 1598

The first of these plays, *Richard II,* marks the culmination of Shakespeare's formal manner. Starting with *King John,* Shakespeare turned more and more toward the method of illusion based on character in action.

Richard II is the masterpiece of formal tragedy in England, the best justification of the dramatic method accepted in 1590. To appreciate the play is to apprehend, in Herbart's words, the "relations formed by a complexity of elements." *Richard* is a nearly perfect work of art. It has about it the incredibly beautiful workmanship of a K'ang-hsi vase. What it does not have is the illusiveness which makes the spectator forget, for the moment, that he is sitting on a hard bench in a damp London theatre.

Structurally, *Richard II* is marked by classical simplicity of outline. As in Greek tragedy there is a late point of attack; after an expository first act the play is essentially the story of Richard's fall.

The action of the play is ritualistic. As Wilson observes, "*Richard II* ought to be played throughout as a ritual. As a work of art, it stands far closer to the Catholic service of the Mass than to Ibsen's *Brand* or to Bernard Shaw's *Saint Joan.*"[6]

Wilson's point is especially relevant to our inquiry. The Catholic Mass is a dramatic ritual in which the hero, Christ, is announced in the Epistle, heard in the Gospel, and called down upon the altar in a ceremony commemorating the Last Supper. The Mass-drama is presentational[7] drama. There is no attempt at "deception" or illusion. The priest is always a priest; when reading an Epistle of Saint Peter or Saint Paul, he does not impersonate the Saint but merely presents his words to the congregation. The scene of the action is always the church, and nowhere else. And at the climax of the Mass, Christ, the unseen hero, is received by the people in Communion.[8]

The character of the Christ-like King Richard is especially well adapted to a ritualistic dramatic form, and the actor who plays the King may be regarded

[5] I follow the dating of E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1930), I, 269-271, and Henry W. Wells, *A Chronological List of Extant Plays Produced in or about London 1581-1642* (1942). Chambers, however, prefers to place each play in a theatrical season (e.g., 1596-1597) rather than in a calendar year.

[6] *Richard II,* ed. J. Dover Wilson (Cambridge, 1939), p. xiii.

[7] Cf. Alexander Bakshy's definitions: "The spectacle can be treated as a true image of life existing outside, and quite independently of the theatre, which form may be called 'representational.' Or it can be treated as an image of life existing in the theatre and finding its expression in the forms of the theatre, which other form may be called 'presentational' " (*The Theatre Unbound,* p. 92).

[8] To the unbeliever, of course, this episode is the greatest of all illusions. But for the believer it is a mystical reality unfolding *in the church.* The communicant is in direct contact not only with priest, acolytes, and choir, but with Christ himself.

as a priest commemorating the fall of the sacrificial victim, Richard. His power challenged at Flint Castle, Richard chants his willingness to step down from his throne:

> I'll give my jewels for a set of beads. . . .[9]
> (III, iii, 147 ff.)

And when finally asked to resign his office, he draws out the abdication at ceremonious length (IV, i, 204 ff). So interpreted, the role takes its place in a formal and presentational spectacle staged in a theatre converted, for the purpose of the tragedy, into a kind of national church. The production will not be illusive; for there will be no attempt to create a reality independent of stage and auditorium.

The simple plot and the ritualistic action conform to the stylized stage business demanded by the text and to the rhetorical patterns in the verse. The opening of IV, i illustrates very well Shakespeare's preoccupation with form. In this passage one character after another issues a challenge and throws down his gage. Although this scene is the most remarkable example of patterned action in *Richard II*, it is not unique. The deposition (which immediately follows) and the kneeling-scene are comparable (V, iii).

Miss Spurgeon remarks that the garden scene is deliberately unnatural.[10] Her comment must be extended to the play as a whole. Gaunt's lengthy pun on his name (II, i, 73-83), which Coleridge tried to justify as a natural expression of passion,[11] must stand or fall on its formalism. Indeed, Gaunt's fine tribute to England (II, i, 40-68) is but a singularly tactful use of sinathrismus.[12] Gaunt's exquisite admonition to Bolingbroke—

> Suppose the singing birds musicians,
> The grass whereon thou tread'st the presence strew'd, . . .
> (I, iv, 288 ff.)

has been attacked[13] as a violation of nature. The critic fails to see that such verse carries the fine art of decoration to a level above which it has never risen.

As a whole, *King John* is as formal as *Richard II*. The sharp outline of the fable, the arbitrary reversals of situation, the tendency to cut away detailed motivation[14]—all this combines with the pageantry of the stage business to produce a panoramic action marked by a bold, if cavalier, design. The characters—all but one—are types. The verse abounds in rhetorical patterns. As in *Richard II*, echoes of Marlowe are frequent.

But Shakespeare is turning toward a new dramatic method. In his earliest plays the tragic formality of his kings and great ones sharply contrasted with the comic and inconsequential yet flexible and resilient manner of his clowns. Neither of these groups was calculated to produce sustained dramatic illusion. The kings usually contented themselves with thunderous verbiage despatched toward the audience on a one-way passage. The clowns, though they often took part in dramatic dialogue, were just as likely to flout illusion by chatting with

[9] I refer to the Oxford edition of Shakespeare, prepared by W. J. Craig.

[10] It is "a kind of allegory, unlike anything in Shakespeare, deliberately inserted at the cost of any likeness to nature, for no human gardeners ever discoursed like these" (*Shakespeare's Imagery* [1936], p. 222).

[11] *Coleridge's Shakespearean Criticism*, ed. Thomas Middleton Raysor (London, 1930), I, 149-150; II, 184-185, 280.

[12] A rhetorical device enabling a speaker to make his point by a "multitude of speeches, not all of one but of divers matters and senses" (George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie*, ed. Gladys Doidge Willcock and Alice Walker [Cambridge, 1936], p. 236).

[13] G. F. Bradby, "King Richard II," in *Short Studies in Shakespeare* (London, 1929), pp. 34-35.

[14] King John commissions Hubert to kill young Arthur. After listening to Arthur's pleas, Hubert determines not to kill the boy. At court, however, Hubert allows John and his courtiers to believe that the deed has been done, though it is apparent that all now wish Arthur alive. Shakespeare assigns Hubert no motive for concealing the truth. In preferring surprise to preparation, Shakespeare is following his source, *The Troublesome Reign of King John*. See J. Dover Wilson's edition of *King John* (Cambridge, 1936), pp. 157-158.

the audience. But in the mid-nineties Shakespeare began to experiment with a third type of dramatic character, one which combined the solidity and "resistance" of the nobleman with the flexibility and resilience of the clown. In *King John,* the Bastard Faulconbridge exemplifies the new Shakespearian type.

For my purpose the people in *King John* may be roughly divided into three classes. First there is Pandulph, the messenger of the Holy See. Pandulph, who probably filled the Elizabethan audience with unmingled loathing, speaks in an elaborately casuistical jargon. His tirade in Act III (i, 263-297) is the most extensive use of antithesis in Shakespeare. One almost supposes that Shakespeare had selected the hateful Pandulph to utter a prolonged blast of rhetoric to end rhetoric. Most of the characters compose a second group speaking now in Marlovian "verse-paragraphs" and now in Kydian patterns. Faulconbridge stands alone. This delightful character, with his patriotic idealism and his rugged irony, serves as an excellent link between the formality of the tragic nobleman and the informality of the Shakespearian commoner. He often employs the figures of the textbooks, but with a difference. Contrast the following examples of sinathrismus, the first as spoken by Gaunt in *Richard II,* the second by Faulconbridge:

This royal throne of kings, this scepter'd isle,
This earth of majesty, this seat of Mars,
This other Eden, demi-Paradise,
. . . . . .
Is now leas'd out,—I die pronouncing it,
Like to a tenement, or pelting farm. . . .
(*Richard* II, II, i, 40-60)

And France, whose armour conscience buckled on,
. . . rounded in the ear
With that same purpose-changer, that sly devil,
That broker, that still breaks the pate of faith,
That daily break-vow, he that wins of all,
. . . . . .
That smooth-fac'd gentleman, tickling Commodity,
Commodity, the bias of the world. . . .
(*King John,* II, i, 564-586)

The passages are too long to quote in full. Despite their similarities, the first is lyrical, the second dramatic. Gaunt is here the voice of England, not an individual Englishman. His diction is elevated; his lines are almost perfectly metrical, and they move with even grace. The Bastard's language is impudent; his verse is breaking away from its metrical frame, and the movement of the passage as a whole is nervous, adaptable. And though he rails at avarice, he is humorously alive to the likelihood that when the proper moment comes he will worship this "tickling Commodity."

Faulconbridge has an interesting speech that may reveal the attitude of the Elizabethan audience in the mid-nineties. As the rival kings of France and England stand before the gates of Angiers and demand admittance, the citizens of the town declare that they will admit Philip if he defeats John in battle, John if he defeats Philip. Faulconbridge cries:

By heaven, these scroyles of Angiers flout you, kings,
And stand securely on their battlements
As in a theatre, whence they gape and point
At your industrious scenes and acts of death.
(II, i, 373-376)

Middleton Murry[15] thinks that these lines indicate the brutal indifference of the "blunt monster with uncounted heads"; and that in letting Faulconbridge belabor the mob, Shakespeare ruefully confesses his failure to hold the audience in thrall. Obviously we are on uncertain ground here. But if Faulconbridge is really describing the temper of the Elizabethan audience in 1596, the attainment of illusion must have been difficult indeed. The course upon which

[15] *Shakespeare* (1936), pp. 102-103.

Shakespeare had embarked was largely uncharted, and we may well believe that he had some unwilling passengers.

The Merchant of Venice was written about the same time as *King John*. On the levels of action, character, and verse, the tragi-comedy is remarkable for the diversity of its style. The casket-story is a pretty tale; the Shylock-plot is compelling drama. As in *King John* we find several classes of dramatic persons, and as a rule each class speaks with its own voice. We have the rhetoric of Arragon's

O! that estates, degrees, and offices
Were not deriv'd corruptly, . . .
How many then should cover that stand bare;
How many be commanded that command;
How much low peasantry would then be glean'd
From the true seed of honour;
(II, ix, 41-47)

the lyricism of Lorenzo's

How sweet the moonlight sleeps upon this bank!
(V, i, 54)

the verbosity of Bassanio's

'Tis not unknown to you, Antonio,
How much I have disabled mine estate,
By something showing a more swelling port
Than my faint means would grant continuance;
(I, i, 122-125)

the equability of Antonio's

Give me your hand, Bassanio: fare you well!
Grieve not that I am fallen to this for you;
(IV, i, 264-265)

and the dramatic power of Shylock's

You have among you many a purchas'd slave
Which, like your asses and your dogs and mules,
You use in abject and in slavish parts,
Because you bought them. . . .
(IV, i, 90-93)

Occasionally a character may change his key. Portia does so oftenest; she can indulge a taste for rhetorical pattern (V, i, 199-202), paint a scene as well as Lorenzo (III, ii, 40-62), speak out in virile prose (I, ii) or resilient verse (III, ii, 1-24).

In creating Shylock, however, Shakespeare clearly broke with tradition. For George Rylands, the transition is essentially from regular verse to passionate prose:

> The significant fact is that Shylock speaks prose, and he is of tragic dimensions. He speaks prose, not all the way through, certainly, but at his best moment (Act III, Sc. i). . . . for the moment character has banished verse, drama has banished poetry.[16]

The point is well taken. But for us, Shylock's great speech in prose[17] and his verse as well are prologue to the tragic drama Shakespeare will bring into existence in the early years of the seventeenth century.

Prose is not necessarily more illusive than poetry. It may be less so. At one point in *Henry IV*, Falstaff delivers a soliloquy on the absurdities of Justice Shallow. Falstaff begins:

> If I were sawed into quantities, I should make four dozen of such bearded hermit's staves as Master Shallow. It is a wonderful thing to see the semblable coherence of his men's spirits and his; they, by observing him, do bear themselves like foolish justices; he, by conversing with them, is turned into a justice-like serving-man.
> (*II Henry IV*, V, i, 64-70)

Here is the inimitable and substantial reality of Sir John Falstaff, as he is known to all Europe. But the reality is a theatric reality. Sir John does not transport us to a world independent of the theatre. He leaves us where we are, and he is talking to us (not, certainly, to

[16] "The Early Shakespearian Manner and Development to the Mature Style," in *Shakespeare Criticism 1919-1935*, ed. Anne Bradby (London, 1937), p. 385.

[17] "Hath not a Jew eyes? . . ." It is noteworthy that when August Strindberg came to write his naturalistic study of the breakdown of a mind—*The Father*—he borrowed Shylock's speech for a crucial scene, translating almost *verbatim*. See *Lucky Peter's Travels and Other Plays*, trans. C. D. Locock (London, 1930), pp. 141-142.

himself). The soliloquy is a confidence from one understanding man to another. So too with Falstaff's movement and gesture—the patting of that side of bacon, the heaving over mountainous terrain of that great belt. Now convert Falstaff's prose into blank verse, making one or two necessary changes:

> If I were sawed into quantities,
> I should make fourteen dozen of such bearded
> Hermit's staves as Master Shallow. 'Tis
> A wondrous thing to see the semblable
> Coherence of his sevrant's spirits and his. . . .

What has happened to the original impression? Some of the humor has gone, of course; but that is not all. The direction of the speech has changed. Falstaff is no longer talking to his audience. In a measure, he is keeping the joke to himself.

In general *Henry IV* creates far more illusion and sustains it far longer than do the earlier plays. Though seemingly disjointed, each of the two parts has a kind of unity.[18] Part I points steadily to the battle of Shrewsbury. In Part II Falstaff and the Court struggle for the loyalty of the Prince; and in the end history has its way—Falstaff is rejected. Largely because of Hotspur, the serious scenes in Part I reach tragic intensity. In Part II, the King is a semi-tragic figure; but although he speaks profound poetry, he seldom gives us the impression of character in action—character acting and acted upon. The comic scenes in Part I attain illusion through intensity of wit-combat; those in Part II through their delightful pictures of life in Gloucestershire.

If Falstaff causes wit in other men, Hotspur arouses his fellow-actors to dramatic action and reaction. When he and Glendower sit down to partition England (*I Henry IV*, III, i), the voice of Hotspur can force that of the lyrical Glendower into an unaccustomed key. Glendower is a poet; but after the jangling interruptions of Hotspur, the Welshman's verse cannot keep its even tenor. For if Glendower says, ". . . at my birth the frame and huge foundation of the world shak'd like a coward," Hotspur will reply, "Why, so it would have done if your mother's cat had but kittened. . . ." The retort will force Glendower to speak his next speech—no matter how equable its rhythms—in a very whirlwind of passion. By introducing one thoroughly dramatic character into the scene, the playwright forces the others to speak the language of illusion.

Part II lacks the dramatic tension of Part I. Hotspur is dead, and there is no one to replace him. And we receive word that the picturesque Glendower is no more. Most of the survivors are orators, not men of action. Informed of his son's death and of the blows dealt at Shrewsbury to the rebels' hopes, Northumberland rather self-consciously likens himself to Priam hearing of the destruction of Troy. A leading conspirator greets with inappropriate reflections[19] what should be the good news of various uprisings against the King. Henry himself is less active than in Part I and even more disposed to weighty commentary. Even in his impressive and artistically mature speech beginning

> O God! that one might read the book of fate. . . .
>
> (III, i, 45)

he is moralizing on the long-popular topic of mutability. Falstaff, too, is inclined to stand still and reflect—though hardly to "moralize" in the usual sense of the term. Finally, the verse in Part II is more traditional than that in Part I. When the rebels confront the forces of

[18] See Robert Adger Law, "Structural Unity in the Two Parts of *Henry IV*," *Studies in Philology*, XXIV (1927), 223-242.

[19] O thou fond many! with what loud applause
Didst thou beat heaven with blessing Bolingbroke
Before he was what thou wouldst have him be . . . .
(*II Henry IV*, I, iii, 99 ff)

the King, the speakers rely more than once on the favorite device of anaphora;[20] Hotspur, though he was a more accomplished speaker than he admitted, could never brook for long the precepts of the schools.

In *Henry V,* Shakespeare is clearly conscious of the problem of illusion. The first Chorus asks apologetically:

> . . . can this cockpit hold
> The vasty fields of France? or may we cram
> Within this wooden O the very casques
> That did affright the air at Agincourt?
> (11-14)

"Let us," the Chorus pleads, "on your imaginary forces work." And again: ". . . 'tis your thoughts that now must deck our kings, . . ." The second Chorus declares that the management will transport the audience to France and back, "charming the narrow seas To give you gentle pass." The third Chorus begs the listeners to "eke out our performance with your mind." The fourth adjures them:

> Sit and see;
> Minding true things by what their mockeries be.
> (52-53)

And the last Chorus appeals to the "quick forge and working-house of thought."

Of the serious characters Henry alone matters, so that one can hardly speak of dramatic "dialogue." Henry reveals himself best in his monologues and soliloquies. These are often genuinely introspective. As a consequence, they are often illusive.

Henry inherits his father's conviction that the crowned head is an uneasy head; but the son's reflections are less monumental, more mobile, than the father's. The younger Harry has also inherited some of the spirit of that Hotspur who had thought it

> . . . an easy leap
> To pluck bright honour from the pale-fac'd moon.
> (*I Henry IV,* I, iii, 201-202)

Henry declares:

> But if it be a sin to court honour,
> I am the most offending soul alive.
> (IV, iii, 31-32)

Similarly, Henry shares Hotspur's preference for fighting against odds. Speaking of Northumberland, Hotspur had said:

> I rather of his absence make this use;
> It lends a lustre and more great opinion,
> A larger dare to our great enterprise . . . .
> (*I Henry IV,* IV, i, 76-78)

And Henry:

> God's peace! I would not lose so great an honour
> As one man more, methinks, could share from me.
> (*Henry V,* IV, iii, 31-32)

The difference between the men is that Hotspur is never introspective; his one soliloquy (*I Henry IV,* II, iii, 16-37), inspired by a distasteful letter, is almost loud enough to reach the ears of his correspondent in a distant part of England. Henry, on the other hand, is capable of talking to himself. His impatient outburst (*Henry V,* IV, i, 253 ff.) following the exit of a cynical soldier recalls Hamlet's solitary cry after his treacherous school-fellows have left him.

Compared with Shakespeare's later heroes, however, Henry is the complete extrovert. As Charles Williams remarks, in Henry's honor "there is no self-contradiction."[21] It is quite otherwise with Brutus—Brutus "with himself at war"; Brutus who cannot sleep for thinking of Caesar. Like Henry, Brutus is an orator; like Henry, he has entered upon public life. But he has a private life as well. His tortured words before the assassination of Caesar—

[20] IV, i, 42-45, 119-122, 154-156. Anaphora is the use of the same word to begin each of a series of lines.

[21] "Henry V," in *Shakespeare Criticism 1919-1935,* p. 187.

Between the acting of a dreadful thing
And the first motion, all the interim is
Like a phantasm, or a hideous dream. . . .
(*Julius Caesar*, II, i, 63-65)

—sound a note that will be heard again and again, if most clearly in Macbeth's aside:

My thought, whose murder yet is but fantastical,
Shakes so my single state of man that function
Is smother'd in surmise. . . .
(*Macbeth*, I, iii, 139-141)

After the turn of the century, the Shakespearian hero will seldom revert to the formalism of the early nineties. He will speak the language of illusion, and his words will make it possible for Shakespeare to "identify actor and audience on the plane of his poetic vision."[22]

[22] Harley Granville-Barker, "From *Henry V* to *Hamlet*," Annual Shakespeare Lecture of the British Academy (1925), p. 29.

LUDWIG TIECK, THEATRICAL REFORMER

HELMUTH HORMANN
Honolulu, Hawaii

REVOLUTIONARY movements, in the theatre as elsewhere, mature after a cumulative and frequently prolonged development. The revolt in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries against the artificialities of the perspectively painted, operatic stage and the concomitant experimentation with simplified methods of presentation germinated in the speculations of earlier theorists. One of these was Ludwig Tieck (1773-1853), a patriarch of German romanticism. And though Tieck's precepts remained for the most part untried during his life, they are replete with implications which the modern student of the theatre can well appreciate.

As collaborator with August Wilhelm von Schlegel in the translation of Shakespeare's plays into German and as one of the first of his nationality to approach the Elizabethan theatre with scholarly devotion, Tieck was instrumental in assuring the English playwright a permanent place in the repertoire of the German theatre.

In 1817, Tieck travelled to England to do theatrical research in the British Museum. He came away shocked by the liberties which managers in London were assuming: "An unprejudiced individual has difficulty in reconciling this tyranny with the respect and worship which the English seem at every opportunity to tender their great poet."[1] He bitterly repudiated the drastic dramaturgic operations which Shakespeare's plays were being subjected to in Germany as well as in England: the promiscuous cutting and arbitrary rearrangement of passages, the insertion of foreign material, and the compression of scenes. Distortions such as these destroyed for Tieck the effectiveness of the drama by obliterating the psychological intentions of the author.[2] He castigated "that violent tearing asunder of emotions, thoughts and transitions, or the elimination of resting places, all of which have been introduced by the wise poet with deliberation, in order to give us the highest kind of delight. . . ."[3] Referring to a scene in *Hamlet*, Tieck wrote, "Shakespeare, whose works as a rule were played without act intermissions, artfully introduced this scene, like so many, in order to allow the spectator some rest

[1] Ludwig Tieck, *Kritische Schriften und dramaturgische Blätter*, (Leipzig, 1848-1852), IV, 319-320.
[2] *Ibid.*, III, 171, 238.
[3] *Ibid.*, III, 239-240.

after the fears . . . of the night and . . . to prepare him for renewed exertion."[4] Justice to the poet, he concluded, can only be done by the use of unexpurgated, uncut texts and by an approximation of the original staging methods of the Elizabethans. But this reversion to older techniques was not necessarily to be confined to Shakespeare. Eventually it was to be applied more generally.

I

Although Ludwig Tieck described his hypothetical stage as being truly "illusionistic," he was not advocating illusion which seeks to deceive the spectator into believing that he is witnessing an actual occurrence in its original setting. Tieck's spectator is to accept the artistic or aesthetic reality conceived by the playwright. This cannot be accomplished by purely objective means, but only by harnessing the spectator's imagination. The dramatist is limited in his endeavors by the character of his prospective audience; that is, by the possibility of inducing it to accept his fiction, for the time being, as perfectly natural. "In order that the play may be real," said Tieck, "the imagination of the spectator must do half the playing."[5] But he, on the other hand, should never for a moment forget his presence in the theatre. While he may be deeply affected, he should never be permitted to lose sight of the fact that he is witnessing a work of art: he must not "fall in love with Juliet as did Romeo; he should see art and be aware of it, understand and experience the drama, but not demand . . . that the personality . . . of the feminine creature appeal to his own, that he himself be enticed and instead of feeling the magic of the poetry be transported into a frenzy which cannot exactly be described as poetical."[6] To the argument that to cast a single actor in several roles in the same performance would be to impair the illusion, he answered, "this material, crude illusion, which is troubled by such things, can and should not be present in the theatre."[7]

The spectator's imagination, Tieck contended, if it is to remain active, is never to be jolted by sudden or unpleasant surprises; nor is its "playing phantasy" to be awakened out of its dream-like state.[8] Nothing approaching the ultimate is to be shown: "the greatest emotion must permit the imagination to surmise something more terrible which does not appear but continually hovers about in spiritual proximity." If this invisible something is disclosed, then ". . . the imagination is lamed and illusion and pleasure are destroyed."[9]

Consistent with this principle of moderation, Tieck was adverse to theatrical effects—whether of acting or staging—which divert the spectator from the drama's content. A genuinely theatrical illusion is present only when the observer "no longer takes a critical pleasure in this or that truth and in isolated beauties but is affected and irrevocably sustained by the emotional stream."[10] Unpretentious scenery, subservient to the playwright's intentions, is preferable to elaborate settings, which are in themselves independent works of art.[11] Verisimilitude and unmitigated historical accuracy are to be avoided in costumes and settings, since a delight in the faithfulness of detail distracts the onlooker from a delight in the play.[12] Tieck, then, was uncompromisingly opposed to the increasing archaeological proclivity of his century. He reproached the German theatre:

[4] *Ibid.*, III, 259.
[5] *Ibid.*, IV, 86.
[6] *Ibid.*, III, 179.
[7] *Ibid.*, III, 274.
[8] *Ibid.*, I, 37-38.
[9] *Ibid.*, IV, 86.
[10] *Ibid*, III, 80.
[11] *Ibid.*, IV, 72.
[12] *Ibid.*, I, 167.

> With an awkward and half schoolmaster-like pedantry we plunder chapels, graveyards, chronicles, books of heraldry, and art galleries, only so that we may reproduce a vulture's wing on a helmet, a buckle, an impossible head-dress . . . as if our audience consisted of armorers and resurrected medieval tailors, for whom the correctness of non-essentials . . . might be the most important element.[13]

"The perception of such realism in the theatre (if ever it was real)," he concluded, "is disgusting and exactly contrary to the real purpose of the play."[14] As a solution for the problem of costuming the historical drama, Tieck recommended the introduction of conventionalized, frankly theatrical, and not necessarily correct apparel.[15] His emphasis was upon suggestion rather than accurate representation. It should be added in passing, however, that Tieck's puritanical attitude toward the decorative arts in the theatre was modified as he matured. In an essay, *Dekorationen,* he conceded that scenic spectacle is a necessary component of the opera and may under certain circumstances be pardonable in the legitimate theatre. He agreed with the view, then prevalent, that the coronation procession in Schiller's *Die Jungfrau von Orleans,* that traditional *pièce de résistance* of spectacle in the German theatre, deserves scenic prominence as the turning point in the fortunes of the Maid, with the distinct proviso that the poetry of the drama is not, in contrast, to become "merely prosaic and dull." Forecasting a similar train of thought to be found in Gordon Craig's essay, *A Plea for Two Theatres,* Tieck prognosticated a type of theatrical fare which was to stress the spectacular, mechanical, and decorative elements and by means of them, within its own sphere, to gain the approval of the most exacting critics.[16]

[13] *Ibid.*, III, 266-267.
[14] *Loc. cit.*
[15] *Ibid.*, II, 229; IV, 19-20; Ludwig Tieck, *Der Junge Tischlermeister* (Berlin, 1854), p. 298.

II

The revolt of Tieck against the theatre of his day was rooted in his respect for the living presence of the actor. He rejected the traditional wings, borders and backdrops, with their elaborately painted perspective, because of their unnaturalness:

> Among the unavoidable evils I include the interruption of the line [of perspective] on the side wings from all but one point of view, the disporportion between the size of the actor when he enters in the background and the perspectively diminished objects, the unfortunate illumination from below and behind, the contradiction between actual lights and shadows and painted ones, the impossibility of diminishing the dimensions of the stage with the result that the interior of palace and hut occupy the identical width and height. . . .[17]

He was disturbed by the prevalent, frequent changes of setting, which he considered believable only in "magical" plays.[18] The excessively high and deep stage, he alleged, not only dwarfed the actor but embarrassed him by forcing him to execute ballet-like exits and entrances and to embark on virtual little voyages in his crosses; its inflexibility resulted in the stilted grouping of players.[19] In the expanding distance between audience and actor the subtler elements of his art were being forfeited and with these the indispensable intimacy between him and his audience.[20]

A stage, so Tieck reasoned, has a specific function to perform, which should be frankly acknowledged—namely, to enable an audience to see and hear the actors. To attempt completely objective

[16] Tieck, *Kritische Schriften,* IV, 73-74; see also Craig, *The Theatre Advancing* (Boston, 1923), pp. 3-33.
[17] Tieck, *op. cit.*, II, 2, 252 ff.
[18] *Ibid.*, III, 23.
[19] *Ibid.*, IV, 51, 85, 325-326, 332.
[20] *Ibid.*, IV, 54, 84, 366.

representation of locale would be to submerge this function: "The stage, in order not to contradict itself in the presentation of poetic drama, must clearly always be nothing more than a stage."[21] In the theatre of his day, the German discerned a disregard "of the most natural demand that in the theatre one really wants to see—and indeed see the human figures and what they are endeavoring to perform on the structure erected for them."[22] As a solution for the problem of visual and acoustic practicability, Tieck proposed his architectural stage, lineally descendent from the Shakespearean, with its permanent levels, its solid, three-dimensional elements.[23]

This stage, described in Tieck's novel *Der Junge Tischlermeister*, is divided into three parts: forestage, upper and inner stages. The proscenium space (not arch) is considerably wider than usual. At the rear of the shallow forestage, two pillars, ten feet high, resting on several wide steps, support the third or upper stage. The inner stage, beneath the upper, is reached by ascending these steps. To the right and left of the inner stage, symmetrically placed flights of stairs lead to the upper stage. Curtains may be used to separate the forestage from the other stages. In the same way, the inner stage can be closed off to permit the introduction of suggestive pieces of scenery to indicate "field, cave, or room."

The customary manner of constructing levels on the early nineteenth century stage—by means of sawhorses and boards—was "difficult, wasteful of time, and crude."[24] The scene-curtain or drop-scene (as differentiated from the act-curtain), which permits extensive rebuilding of the scene during an act, was not yet in use.[25] Tieck's stage, with its structural advantages, obviated the need for lengthy, illusion-destroying waits.

Basically, Tieck's stage was comprised of elements which are, with some exceptions, still considered characteristically Elizabethan—principally the exposed and extremely prominent flights of stairs leading to the upper stage. In a sketch, dated circa 1835, he and two collaborators attempted an accurate reconstruction of the Fortune Theatre of Shakespeare's day. The presence of the two stairways in this drawing is evidence that he misinterpreted them as being historically in keeping.[26]

Two pencil sketches of projected unit settings for a performance of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, discovered among Goethe's papers and deposited in the Goethe Nationalmuseum, bear a striking resemblance to Tieck's stage as described in *Der Junge Tischlermeister* and to the stage which he used in 1843 for his Potsdam production of the same play. Tieck visited the venerable poet in Weimar on June 8 and 9, 1828, and it is conceivable that these hastily executed drawings were not by Goethe as has generally been supposed, but by Tieck or by Tieck and Goethe together. At any rate, it seems probable that they were the result of a conversation during which the two poets, pencil in hand, discussed the prospects of reviving the play in this manner.[27]

Tieck's advocacy of a shallow acting area was correlated with the wide, narrow form of his stage. His demand that all that had been presented "en face" be extended into "profile," applied not to the position of the individual actor

[21] Tieck, *Der Junge Tischlermeister*, p. 299.
[22] Tieck, *Kritische Schriften*, IV, 84.
[23] *Ibid.*, IV, 52-334.
[24] Tieck, *Der Junge Tischlermeister*, p. 268.
[25] "Shifts" of any magnitude were confined to the intervals between acts, or carried out during the act with the curtain open, though usually on a darkened stage. See: Rudolph K. Goldschmitt, *Eduard Devrients Bühnenreform am Karlsruher Hoftheater* (Leipzig, 1921), p. 83; also Gisbert v. Vincke, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Bühnengeschichte* (Leipzig, 1893), p. 95.
[26] Gertrud Hille, *Die Tieck-Sempersche Rekonstruktion des Fortuna Theaters* (Berlin, 1929), Plate I.
[27] These sketches are reproduced in *Theatre Arts Prints* (1929).

but to entire groupings which were to be extended into relief.[28] Downstage wings were to replace those upstage for entrances and exits; processions, instead of proceeding awkwardly forward from the depth of the stage, were now to cross in the foreground.[29] The proscenium was no longer to represent an inviolable demarcation: "Some actors, even among the experienced, have imagined that there where the curtain descends the playing space must be bounded, because they mistakenly believe that their performance is a moving painting and as such must be surrounded by a definite frame."[30] The English actors in Kemble's company merited Tieck's approbation because they did not hesitate to overstep the curtain-line.[31]

In opposing the interpretation of the stage as a picture in its frame, the German theorist was not adverse to achieving a picturesque effect. Further insight can be gleaned from his appraisal of the advantages of the Elizabethan stage: "no person covered the other, all were independently and equally set into frames, by means of which the figurative and pictorial elements were emphasized."[32] Tieck here used the plural of the word, "frames." He referred not to a single composition, arbitrarily set into its frame, nor a negative and loosely connected background, but to a setting with solid and practical steps and levels—to a setting which afforded the actors physical support, which permitted them to come closer to the spectator and still remain visible, even when arranged behind each other. In the interpretation of their roles they were aided by the three-dimensional, architectural components of the stage; in battles, combatants could storm over the steps, melancholy or reflective individuals were able to lean against the pillars.[33] "This older theatre," Tieck wrote, "which we are here imitating in miniature, itself becomes an actor in every scene; it can be included as one of the main characters; it facilitates every actor's playing; it helps him, sustains him. He does not stand neglected in a desolate, empty square, but can support himself everywhere, both spiritually and physically. . . ."[34]

III

In 1825, Tieck was appointed official dramaturgist to the Dresden Court Theatre, but was not privileged unrestrictedly to apply his theories. In effect, his practical usefulness was confined to that of dramatic coach and literary adviser. In most practical details he was compelled to accede to the demands of commercially-minded directors. His association with the theatre in Dresden, however, continued for sixteen years, a chronicle of frustration. In 1841, he was invited to join the King of Prussia's intimate circle in Berlin as well as to produce a series of *Festvorstellungen* under royal patronage. Here at long last was an opportunity to fulfill his cherished plans.

In 1843, Tieck directed *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in the little theatre of the Neue Palais in Potsdam. The stage used for this occasion, with its three levels and its stairways leading to an upper stage, fundamentally resembled the Tieck-Semper-Baudissin reconstruction of the Fortune and the pencil sketches found among Goethe's papers. Unfortunately, Tieck was deterred from a complete application of his original plans, as sketched in *Der Junge Tischlermeister*, by the inflexibility of the eighteenth century theatre at his disposal. He had furthermore to pacify the tempera-

[28] Tieck, *Kritische Schriften*, III, 173.
[29] Tieck, *Der Junge Tischlermeister*, p. 265.
[30] Tieck, *Kritische Schriften*, IV, 84.
[31] *Loc. cit.*
[32] Tieck, *Der Junge Tischlermeister*, p. 267.
[33] *Ibid.*, p. 266.
[34] *Ibid.*, p. 268.

mental Felix von Mendelssohn, whose music, composed specifically for this event, demanded a large orchestra. In order to accomodate the musicians, Tieck was forced to curtail his plan of projecting his forestage beyond the proscenium arch.[35] He was too old and tired to object. Contrary to his conception that changes of locale were to be suggested by little more than minor changes of the inner stage, he buried the solid, three-dimensional structure almost beyond recognition in foliage.[36] For the artisan's scene, he permitted the intrusion of a conventional drop—in painted perspective. Friedrich Haase found the production to have been more spectacular than was customary in that pageantry-loving era.[37] The reviewer for the *Illustrirte Zeitung,* which carried an illustration of the setting, described the event as "a mixture of historical curiosities, of the phantastical, and of spectacular ballet-like trimmings."[38] It is tragic that, instead of demonstrating his ideas convincingly, Tieck compromised them to such an extent that the result was diametrically opposed to his original intentions. Indeed, this production can perhaps be classified as the first of a chain of elaborated versions of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* which culminated in Max Reinhardt's exhibitions.

IV

A discussion of Tieck's theories calls for at least cursory mention of a production in 1840 of *Twelfth Night,* under the direction of a contemporary, Karl Immermann. A more eclectic personality than Tieck, Immermann experimented in many directions. In this, his only attempt at simplified staging, he admittedly was inspired by Tieck. That his *Twelfth Night* in Düsseldorf was carried out on an amateur basis was a distinct advantage since it obviated the need for making concessions to a conservative public.[39]

Immermann echoed Tieck in his appraisal of the advantages of the Elizabethan stage over the existing one:

> The action, so to speak, is projected into the audience; the falsely illusionistic has been completely abandoned, on the other hand, the genuinely illusionistic, the spiritually poetic [*geistig Poetische*] element has been emphasized the more. . . . The modern stage attempts, by virtue of all the means of illusionism, to bring the locale before the eyes of the spectator. . . . Our stage disclaims all pretensions to this deception which one calls truth to nature; it rests on the principle that in the drama human action is essential and the setting only secondary.[40]

In his practical application of Tieck's principles, nevertheless, Immermann made several changes, suggesting a compromise between the Elizabethan and ancient Greek stages.[41] He discarded Tieck's upper stage, and the flights of stairs leading to it, as well as the masking curtains, intended to serve as a single set of wings, replacing these with a more unified architectural arrangement, consisting of a substantially constructed, classical facade. The inner stage, as with Tieck, was separated from the main stage level by a few shallow steps. It was flanked on either side by sufficient doors and arches to afford six separate means of making exits and entrances. Immermann considered this variation of Tieck's stage to be functionally suited to the play's action:

> The width of the scene immeasurably facilitated the arrangement of the listening

[35] Julius Petersen, *Ludwig Tiecks Sommernachtstraum-Inszenierung* (Berlin, 1929), p. 183.

[36] A suggestion of foliage is indeed detectable in one of the Goethe-Tieck sketches.

[37] Edgar Gross, *Die Ältere Romantik und das Theater* (Hamburg, 1910), p. 30.

[38] *Illustrirte Zeitung* (Leipzig, Dec. 21, 1844), p. 398.

[39] Richard Wittsack, *Karl Leberecht Immermann der Dramaturg* (Berlin, 1914), p. 70.

[40] Adolf Winds, *Die Geschichte der Regie* (Berlin, Leipzig, 1925), p. 77.

[41] *Ibid.*, Plate 50.

and eavesdropping scenes and everything that approximates a simultaneous double action. . . . The great number of openings usable for exits and entrances permitted the action to be kept constantly moving, as for example in the scene where Malvolio is sought out as a supposed madman. Malvolio stood in the center of the large forestage, Sir Toby appeared from behind the curtain of the little stage, Maria and Fabian out of the side doors. Thus he was surrounded by his teasing pursuers.[42]

Both Immermann and Tieck were concerned primarily with giving their actors "playable" stages.

V

Quite apart from the foregoing examples, however, it is apparent that during Tieck's life, conditions were not ripe for a widespread acceptance of his theories. The trend towards spectacle was in the ascendancy and had inexorably to run its course. The nineteenth century theatre, reaping the fruits of scientific progress, was as yet attempting to improve existing formulas without materially changing them. Shortly after mid-century, the Germans began to hear reports from across the channel of the pageantry of Charles Kean's Shakespearean "revivals." The inestimable influence of English methods upon the German theatre culminated in the theatre of the Meininger. The Duke of Meiningen's stage, with its emphasis on historical realism and its elaboration of detail, was antithetical to that of Ludwig Tieck; some affinity to Tieck is discernible in Duke Georg's insistance upon reducing to a minimum the painful contrast between painted perspective and living actor, in his substantial, plastic scenery, and in his skilful dramaturgic use of a variety of stage levels. Tieck's influence is more apparent in the "Mystery-stage" of Otto Devrient; in the *Shakespearebühne* of Savits, Perfal, and Lautenschläger; in the "relief" stage of Georg Fuchs' *Münchner Künstlertheater;* and in the architectural stage of Copeau's *Théâtre du Vieux Colombier.* Finally from some points of view Tieck may be considered a forerunner of Appia and Craig.

[42] Richard Fellner, *Geschichte einer deutschen Musterbühne* (Stuttgart, 1888), pp. 193-194.

INTERPRETATIVE READING AS AN AID TO SPEECH CORRECTION, ACTING, AND RADIO

SARA LOWREY
Baylor University

EDUCATORS today emphasize the importance of the whole (Gestalt) and the significance of integration of subject matter, especially in the elementary grades and fundamentals courses. In spite of this emphasis, tendencies seem frequently to be toward segregation of parts from the whole. Even in our NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH our conventions break up into parts, such as Theatre, Speech Correction, Radio, and sections on Debate, Public Speaking, Interpretative Reading, and the like.

Possibly this segregation is essential for organized consideration of the needs and progress of the various parts; yet it might be of more profit for the debaters to attend the interpretative readers' section, the readers to attend the speech correction meetings and the speech correctionists to attend the theatre assemblies. Such practice might broaden the outlook of teachers and help us to per-

ceive the interrelationship of our speech fields. We gain much from fellowship with others in our fields; we all have need of an exchange of ideas and continual emphasis upon fundamental attitudes related to our specific tasks; but may we not also gain much from a review and exchange of ideas from related fields? It appears that in the emphasis upon divisions we have frequently climbed out on limbs and neglected the trunk of the tree from which the branches gain sustenance and, in fact, life.

We are hearing a good deal these days about discipline. The word is coming back into favor. Are we in the field of speech ready to assume the responsibility of speech disciplines both as representatives of effective speech and as teachers who exact something from our students? Do teachers of speech correction, for example, deserve the verdict that they emphasize everything except speech?

Of course it may seem easier to criticize than to do. When one becomes involved in the intricacies of a subject he may be somewhat justified in neglecting certain aspects of simplified forms. On the other hand it appears that teachers of speech should emphasize fundamentals of speech in the same way that the fundamentals of writing are emphasized. We are perhaps more rigid in our adherence to the written form in a Ph.D. thesis than in a Freshman composition. Are not some phases of speech so truly fundamental as to justify continual emphasis from the fundamentals course to the oral examination for a doctor's degree?

Three phases of speech training seem obvious as fundamental: voice and diction, speechmaking, and reading. These three aspects are usually emphasized in a fundamentals course. It is also generally believed that students may not gain sufficient background or habits in a single course and that courses giving special emphasis to voice and diction, public speaking, and sometimes interpretative reading are of value as prerequisite to specialization in any one field of speech, particularly to the fields of speech correction, acting, and radio.

I

In speech correction oral reading may prove both a means of preventing speech difficulties and a method of treatment. If a child is taught to concentrate upon an idea by holding the "image" of it before his mind with his eyes off the page, in order that he may get the symbolic significance of the word, nervous tensions will give way to normal enjoyment and to physical response to the *matter* of the printed page. In this manner the student develops confidence and the habit of drinking deeply from the heritage of poetry, philosophy, and history, that is, the habit of *experiencing the reality* of the printed page in place of the habit of skimming.

The therapeutic value of interpretative reading, accordingly, should be emphasized. Interpretative reading may be considered one of the humanities, the purpose of which is to give students balance and proportion in their thinking. Oral reading is then of value both as an escape from life and as a means of adjustment to life. The latter aspect is in harmony with the philosophy of teachers of speech correction who teach students to face the situation realistically and with courage. When interpretative reading is taught well it serves as a means of broadening the scope of the student's experience, hence giving him a better perspective for life. Social adjustment should be one of the primary objectives of a course in interpretative reading. The content of the course may contribute a great deal as mental hygiene for the student.

Skill in any pursuit is therapeutic. The value of speech training as thera-

peutic treatment is generally recognized by psychiatrists. One value is that when it is taught well the patient's attention is directed away from himself. It is frequently recommended that the patient develop a hobby. The best type of hobby is one which calls for creative effort. Interpretative reading may plunge one into a realm of adventure which will give him release from the tensions which have caused his maladjustment. Skill in interpretative reading is both a preventive and a cure for maladjustments which frequently result in speech defects. Skill in interpretative reading builds self-confidence and poise.

Interpretative reading as a method of reeducation in articulation is obvious. Drill books always include passages from great literature with a variety of material which calls for varied adjustment of articulatory organs. The literature selected for such drills offers, also, a variety of moods and hence draws forth different psychical responses. If in using drills for speech reeducation the teacher will emphasize the idea and the mood of the literature on a par, at least, with the mechanical adjustment of the articulatory organs, facility in articulation will result much more surely and successfully. Speech as such may be the last rather than the first thing to be emphasized in speech correction. Some attention may be needed for the accurate formation of individual speech sounds, but articulation which results from concentration upon the projection of meaning is more satisfactory than that gained by conscious effort to form speech sounds accurately. This leads us to Stanislavski's warning to the young actor that voice drills if isolated from meanings may result in habits which preclude good acting. Good tone and clear articulation are not enough for good speech habits. In all voice and diction drills in which passages of literature are used the student's concentration should be directed to meaning and to the adequate expression of that meaning. Even in exercises voice and diction should be a means to an end and not ends in themselves. Interpretative reading, accordingly, is an important aspect in speech correction both as mental hygiene and as a method of improving a student's articulate speech.

Freedom and control of the body are recognized as essentials in speech correction. Interpretative reading emphasizes bodily freedom, not as an end in itself but as a means of adequately experiencing and expressing ideas. The body tonicity and freedom gained by interpretative reading should be a natural means to an end, the end being the enjoyment and projection of meaning. Bodily tensions disappear and coordination results when the pupil reacts spontaneously to moods of literature. Motor and organic imagery are emphasized as ways of experiencing and projecting the reality of literature. They are important means of achieving freedom for physiological and psychological adjustment.

II

The value of interpretative reading like that of all other phases of speech depends in a large measure upon the way it is taught. In this respect it does not differ from other phases of learning. George Eliot said, "The most important step toward getting mental power is the acquisition of a right method of working." In discussing the relation of interpretative reading to the art of acting, we shall assume that it is well taught.

Whether one is a teacher of acting or of interpretative reading, one may gain something by considering the relation of each to the other. In the first place, acting *is* interpretative reading. We often hear and see in print the statement, "Reading is not acting." Teachers of

interpretative reading have had adequate opportunity to be impressed with that truth. The pitfall for many interpretative readers is the failure to understand the difference between reading and acting. Paradoxically the pitfall of many actors is a failure to understand the relation of interpretative reading to acting. Here is a paradox which students of interpretative reading and acting should recognize: interpretative reading is not acting but acting *is* interpretative reading.

Let us consider first the problem of interpreting a role. Perhaps we can best consider it by reviewing an experience in the theatre. When I heard Otis Skinner in the role of Shylock, I was amazed and delighted with his interpretation, his projection of the character's point of view. He gave me a new concept of the character and a more tolerant attitude toward the entire Jewish race.

I don't think I was guilty of racial prejudice before, but I had accepted what had seemed to be the usual interpretation of Shylock as "a mean old Jew" who loved money more than his daughter and was looking for an opportunity to get even with Antonio and so devised the bond as a legal method of killing his enemy. But when I heard Otis Skinner's Shylock I received a new interpretation of Shylock; I realized that Shylock had a point of view. Through his acting and more specifically through his interpretative reading of the lines Otis Skinner made me see things, for the first time, from Shylock's viewpoint.

Now I had made a careful study of *The Merchant of Venice* covering a period of a year or more. One of my students and I had worked for six months on a cutting and arrangement of the play. We thought we'd done a good job. In fact, we thought our arrangement superior to the Maude Adams' arrangement in which Otis Skinner participated. We had also produced the play and our Shylock had received the usual acclaim a hometown audience gives to an amateur when he does acceptable work: "He was professional! He is better than a Broadway actor I saw in the role." But when my amateur Shylock and I sat at the feet of Otis Skinner we knew that Skinner's Shylock was something distinctive and that his distinction was due to a careful interpretation of his role and skilful reading of the lines. Otis Skinner had looked at the play from Shylock's point of view; he presented that viewpoint through skilful reading.

I knew by Skinner's reading of the lines that Shylock did, as the lines said, initiate the bond "in merry sport" just to prove to Antonio that he was not interested in amassing money at the expense of Antonio's misfortune. I saw that it was only after months of ridicule and humiliation climaxed by the stealing of his daughter (as well as by the robbery of his money and jewels) that Shylock was driven to seek revenge. In fact, Otis Skinner's interpretation of the lines was so clear that I knew the very *moment* when Shylock decided to exact the penalty. Shylock had come into the courtroom deeply troubled over his daughter's marriage with one of another race, a race that looked down upon and persecuted her people. When Antonio and the other Christians entered the courtroom they took up their scoffing and abuse against Shylock because he was a Jew. Then the idea was born in Shylock's mind, "Let him look to his bond." The idea grew, *"Let him look to his bond."* The actor built the idea: "LET HIM LOOK TO HIS BOND."

Several years after this significant experience in the theatre, I had the opportunity of hearing Otis Skinner on a Town Hall program. In his lecture (which was an unforgettable experience for a teacher of interpretative reading) he gave his method of interpreting roles

and told the story of his interpretation of Shylock very much as I have told it above. I had understood from his interpretation of the lines exactly what he told as he spoke of his technique of character analysis and his approach to the role.

Interpretative reading serves as a basis for acting when the student of interpretative reading learns to interpret lines by going back of the lines to the point of view of the character. In interpretative reading, the student's mind should be focussed not on "doing" but upon discovering the meaning of the lines and projecting that meaning to others. Interpretative reading deals with fundamentals—fundamentals of acting—fundamentals which form an excellent basis for any speech skill, especially that of acting.

One advantage in the study of interpretative reading as a way of learning the art of acting is that it does not limit a student to a single role or to a single type of literature or experience. Its objective is to interpret meanings and to develop skill in projecting meaning. A variety of relatively short selections may be studied. The first question usually asked by the interpretative reader is, "What do the lines say?" (what is the author attempting to communicate?). The next question may be, "How may I project that meaning to others?" These are *first* things in *acting*. A student should be able to develop quite a degree of skill in finding the meaning and giving expression to meaning in a single course in interpretative reading. For this phase of acting, a student is likely to receive better development in a course in interpretative reading than in a course in acting. First, he is not involved in the intricacies of body and movement, yet he is gaining experience in a fundamental mental process from which total bodily position and movement evolve—naturally and hence effectively. Second, he is not limited to a single role, a type of character and hence a type of thinking; nor does he have to wait and watch, and in many cases waste time, while some one with a longer and more important role is working. There is very little opportunity for a student of interpretative reading to become typed and develop the idea that he is limited to one type of character. Variety, flexibility, and scope are the essence of the study of interpretative reading.

Many of the fundamentals of effective acting can be taught in a course in interpretative reading so as to give every student an equal opportunity. Too often in an acting course those who get long roles are given superior training to those who are cast in minor parts. This tendency can be cared for, to a certain extent, by the assignment of short scenes, pantomimes, and monologues. In a course in interpretative reading, however, a single experience before the class may be as brief as a sonnet, a lyric or a paragraph of prose. It may extend to a scene, a short story, a monologue, or even to a complete play, a novel, or a biography. In each type of experience, the student has opportunity for variety and unity, and many other elements of effective acting such as imagery, pause, tempo, rhythm, build, topping, illusion, tone quality and projection. His concentration, meanwhile, is directed to an often neglected, but extremely important aspect of acting: the effective reading of lines.

III

Notorious among the comments on Commencement speakers is the accusation, "He read his speech." In the minds of the general public the reading of a speech seems in itself to be a reason for condemnation since it appears to be an accepted fact that public speakers are

not good readers. While this attitude may not be wholly justifiable and the critics of the reading of a speech may judge the whole by a very small part, still it seems that the general public assumes that to read from a manuscript is inevitably to be dull.

Now radio has come and some people seem not to be aware of that Franklin Delano Roosevelt read his speeches. The President simply talked to the people in what soon were called, "Fireside Chats." Here was a speaker who read from a manuscript with the informality, spontaneity, and directness of a father chatting with his family about the fireside. These radio speeches of the President were excellent examples of effective interpretative reading.

While there is much extempore, even some impromptu, speaking in radio broadcasts, much of what is said on the air is read. Much of it is well read. Many of our news commentators who read from manuscript sound as if they are "just talking." Yet, many of those known as "newscasters" need to master the fundamentals of interpretative reading in order that they may communicate more effectively to their listeners. So do radio actors and readers of commercials. The chief pitfall in reading is a smooth, rhythmical pattern which sounds good but which fails to project the meaning to the listener. The teacher of interpretative reading should be able to help the student to find a way of reading which will communicate as simply and as effectively as extempore speaking. Furthermore, he can combat "arty" reading, for one of the ideas which the modern speech teacher has attacked with real fervor is that the study of speech is for ornamentation rather than for serious and practical uses. We have dropped the word *art* from our associations. Most of our departments are called Speech and not Speech Arts. We recognize that speech is an art and a science, but we have found a place among the *liberal* arts rather than with the so-called *fine arts,* because we recognize that speech is a tool needed by everybody.

The utility of interpretative reading is now as evident as that of public speaking. It is essential for those who make their livings at the microphone to be good readers—readers who by signs of which the audience are unaware succeed in commanding the interest and attention of listeners.

It may be of value to mention a criticism frequently offered by commercial radio. It is that speech training (expression, oral interpretation, dramatics) may prove a handicap instead of a help to the radio speaker. Radio speech calls with no uncertain voice for "the art which conceals its artistry." A little learning has been called a dangerous thing. That student who has delved just deep enough into the intricacies of interpretative reading to be conscious of *how* does not know *what* will offend radio listeners and will cause the lords of commercial radio to condemn in more certain tones the study which produced such affectation. The person who reads too easily and too smoothly offends as surely as the one who is stilted or affected. "The illusion of the first time" is a *sine qua non* of interpretative reading for radio, and it cannot be achieved without long and directed study and practice.

It is our problem as teachers of speech to find a way of giving our students training in *fundamentals* which will be of real value in a realistic world. Interpretative reading is a fundamental phase of speech training. It is an essential in the fields of speech correction, acting, and radio.

SPEECH: SCIENCE AND/OR ART

MOIREE COMPERE
Michigan State College

THIS is a world of extremes. We tend to be either/or! New ideas hit us and we are swept along in the flood of enthusiasm for the new, or we are recalcitrant and refuse to cooperate at all.

When the all-out war effort became necessary, technology, scientific courses, "practical" experience—these became the sinews of war. Other things had to be side-tracked or derailed completely; cultural courses were shunted to a siding, although they held the ideals for which we fought. College liberal arts courses were relegated into a limbo of little or no activity, and nearly all emphasis was placed on scientific achievement, research and study. Speech followed the general trend, and Interpretation suffered most. The trend toward the scientific, which had begun before the war, was accelerated, and catalogues of speech departments show fewer and fewer Interpretation courses.

It is ironic that while we fought to keep alive the democratic ideal, we still had to defend the role of cultural studies. While we fought a philosophy that burned books because of the germs of freedom contained therein, we deadened the impulses of democratic citizens to find out for themselves what books contain—books that reveal the lives, the culture, the civilization, the philosophy that has brought us thus far.

It is wasteful of space, so it seems on the surface, to repeat what has been said so many times. Books are the repositories of the aspirations of man; they are the guardians of the rights of the individual; they contain the spark that keeps alive the struggle for freedom; they are the record of the endless struggles of man. Why then should we fail to encourage any possible method of finding out what is in those books?

Since speech is the study of a means of communication, certainly one of the most important phases of speech is the ability to secure ideas worth communicating. Where is a better source of knowledge than the books of the past and present? What needs more emphasis in any curriculum than the best means of finding out what is in books? What better means than reading? Is there any method which will eclipse habits learned in good oral reading? Is there any teacher of any subject anywhere, who will claim that his students can read well enough from the printed page to organize the ideas on that page for efficient learning?

It is not necessary, nor sensible, to decry science in Speech. We have needed the impetus, the research, and the beginning of scientific exactness that has been ours in the last few years. Speech correction is vitally important and will become more so as larger groups of soldiers with speech defects have to be dealt with. Voice science, radio technique, and every other scientific aspect must continue to hold their rightful places. It is not necessary, however, to swing so far toward science that we lose sight of our obligation to teach literature and its appreciation, or that we swing completely from the cultural to the scientific. Speech need not be an either/or affair.

It seems eminently worth while, in the field of speech, to reevaluate our courses of study for the purpose of determining whether or not they are overloaded with classes and studies and publications stressing the speech science angle, and barren on the side which develops the imaginative, the vital, and the cultural.

Indeed, I suggest that Oral Reading or Interpretation, having lost its vitality in our speech program and its rightful place in our courses of study, should not only be restored but enlarged and made more fundamental.

It is not enough to teach silent reading, even if that is taught efficiently. Neither do we have to get into an either/or argument over silent and oral reading. Each has its important place. But the emphasis for far too long has been on silent reading, and most people have understood too little the values of habits gained in the proper kind of oral reading.

Silent reading is for skimming, covering ground, getting the gist, keeping up with the vast quantities of material turned out by printing presses, knowing what is happening in this world where things happen so fast. It must be efficiently learned, coherently practiced, and deftly used. But it can never take the place of skill in oral reading.

In fact, skills learned in oral reading can be utilized in silent reading so that it, too, becomes more efficient. But this seems to have been misunderstood by most people. For many years emphasis has been on silent reading. Reading experts have figured out methods for recognizing many more words per minute. Eye movements have been figured to the nicety of a point.

An illustration of the importance assigned to silent reading may be cited. Each summer in the University of Chicago, Dr. W. S. Gray, Dean of the Department of Education, has a week's reading conference. All day, each day for the whole week, experts with skill and experience in the reading field are brought in to discuss every phase of the reading problem. At night, conferences are held where questions may be asked the speakers, dealing with any phase of the problem under discussion. This is a nationally famous conference at which hundreds of people are in attendance. Proceedings are published as a permanent record. The Reading Conference was organized in 1938 to serve four purposes: "To provide opportunity for the discussion of reading problems at various levels of general education . . . ; to stimulate critical discussion of current trends and needs in reading in various types of schools and at different grade levels; to describe and evaluate the methods and the results of recent experiments relating to reading; and to stimulate further study of the many perplexing problems that schools face today."[1]

Not until the summer of 1944 did authorities in charge of this reading conference begin to consider that poor reading might be helped by oral reading. They then realized that a valuable part of the whole reading field had been neglected. Accordingly, one day out of the week's conference was devoted to the problems of oral reading. I was privileged to be a part of that conference to represent oral reading. It was my definite impression that a trend toward oral reading is resulting from needs which educators have discovered can be met in no other way.

Interpretation teachers must be ready with a program which can take advantage of the trend and utilize it for securing the greatest results for the greatest number. We have not, at the present moment, either the courses or the teachers to train even elementary school teachers in oral reading skills.

Interpretation, as a phase of instruction in speech, is not an either/or proposition. It is true that teachers of Interpretation are charged with the responsibility of encouraging the reading and appreciation of literature. But it is equally true that they are teaching oral

[1] *Supplementary Educational Monographs*, No. 57, University of Chicago (December, 1943), p. iii.

reading and that, because they are, to them falls the responsibility of establishing habits in the minds of students which will carry over to all reading, habits which will make organization possible, concepts easier to grasp, and understanding clearer.

Besides helping a student to read well before an audience, all habits taught in oral reading ought to reinforce and actuate silent reading. Phrasing, eye span, grouping, centering, dominance of words for emphasis, responsibility for both denotational and connotational meanings are all actual needs of any reading situation.

In the first place, as many readers know, phrasing and eye span are the fundamental principles of all reading if the student is ever going to learn organization of ideas as he reads. Too much emphasis has been put on reading "words" rather than groups of words or units of thought which we call phrasing. The first-grade child is taught to recognize words, then to put them together in units that range from the simplest to the most complicated as he increases in ability to recognize words of greater difficulty. The trouble is that he is allowed to go on forever just recognizing words and stringing them together. If he ever phrased in conversation on the doubtful level of "I–see–the–cat" method, his teacher would pounce on him more quickly than he has been able to pounce on the cat and either teach him better at once, fail him, or class him definitely with the moron section! But he is allowed to read like that throughout the grades, high school and college! It is a perpetual and permanent wail from all college teachers that few students can read intelligently.

It is the job of oral reading, then, to inculcate habits of phrasing, to drill the student on "eye span"–teaching him to recognize phrases, units of ideas, as readily as he has been calling a single word. He should be taught to make the right word or words dominant, to make the others subservient in the proper relationship. He is able to establish this habit better in reading aloud than in silent reading for he has the double check of his ear and eye. If he is taught to check himself against the gauge of what he knows he would sound like in good conversation, he can learn to check himself for correct phrasing, not to mention the proper inflections and meanings that go along with it.

There is, furthermore, the habit of word appreciation engendered by speaking which he can never get in any other way. In the first place, he cannot fake when he reads orally. He cannot guess at words and *think* he knows their meaning from the context. Vocabularies are usable words, words that the student can shape in his mouth and use in sentence formations. He may read them ten thousand times in silent reading, but never possess them until he has formed them in sound properly at least once. A student does not know what he cannot put into form. Form in communication is a combination of symbols into words and there is no form without the symbol. When he has read aloud some beautiful combination in literature, he can never again be as poverty stricken for means of expression; he will never again be quite as chaotic in his thinking because the idea has found form for expression at least once.

Oral reading trains in love and respect for words and curiosity about them. Until he has heard himself or somebody else read words with their rightful color, warmth, intonation, inflection and meaning, a student has never really known them. Education has to begin with words for a tool. Lack of training in oral reading will forever furnish unsharpened tools for all future work.

Hearing good oral reading is another requirement of any student who is being instructed in "form" for expression. This hearing has to come from two sources—either the teacher's reading, or recordings. If the teacher cannot show what he means by excellent oral reading, the student will be cheated by that much. He learned to speak originally by hearing and he will never learn to read aloud well until he has heard what good reading can be like.

Every interpretative reader has had the same experiences I have had, both in class and in more formal programs. The student or the members of an audience will say, "I read that book, but I never got out of it what you have given us today." They never will get the fullest richness until they are trained to read orally because the vitality of the words comes from a personal knowledge of color, emotion, sound, warmth, taste—personal experiences with the word. Sound has its importance, as well as sense. This is particularly true of poetry which was meant to be read out loud, and will never be appreciated at its best until it is heard well read. The good teacher, then, needs to be an artist, a reader, as well as a teacher.

William Lyon Phelps in the foreword to *Poet's Gold* by David Ross has this to say about effectiveness of oral reading of literature. "The late Professor Hiram Corson of Cornell University used to say that no man was fitted to teach literature unless he had a good voice and was able to recite verse impressively. His own teaching was almost entirely confined to reading aloud, with a few words of comment. When I was a graduate student at Harvard more than forty years ago, I learned more of the meaning of Shakespeare by hearing Professor Child read dialogue, than I did by most of the exploratory and critical notes."

Shall we say that thus the cultural can be very practical as well? No less practical and necessary are the other values when literature and life meet. It is axiomatic that literature has the extraordinary power of widening and deepening the sympathies of men. Life is necessarily restricted; individual living is within narrow areas and still narrower fields of reasoning without the vistas of knowledge found in the records of living throughout the ages. There can be no successful contradiction of the statement that sharing the experiences of literature opens up vistas of immeasurable understanding without which we will never progress very rapidly in tolerance and understanding. Training in oral reading opens up such channels of communication.

Oral reading also provides training in discrimination. Never before, in spite of war conditions and paper shortages, have books and papers piled off the press with such rapidity. The world is flooded with ideas. How will people find the right values, how learn to discriminate the shabby from the good, the truth from evil? If we preserve the freedom of the press, its right to pour words indiscriminately into the world of the mind, then we must train the mind to judge what is thus poured out, how to exercise judgments of value. Exclusive training in silent reading will never do this. The power of the voice, the force of meaning as carried in inflection patterns, the many kinds of interpretation for each selection read—all carry the inevitable proof that the student must learn the right interpretation through training himself to get the real meaning from the black symbols on the printed page.

Now is the time to consider proofs of the lack of vitality in the oral reading program. First, there is a dearth of graduate students in Interpretation as indicated by the absence of their names in lists of M.A. and Ph.D. graduates. Sec-

ond, there are little research and no important reports on needed projects. Speech Correction finds its work so vital and necessary that it has an organization separate from that of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH and runs a constant program throughout the better part of three days at the national meeting. Interpretation has one hurried hour of meeting, and two reading hours crowded into the end of a busy day. Student reading hours and demonstrations have been rare, although they were good when held. There are no committees, temporary or permanent, working on suggested subjects for research and encouraging reports on varied projects in Oral Interpretation so that all teachers may profit by what is being tried successfully by the best and most tireless of teachers.

Members in attendance at our conventions walk into a Speech Correction meeting and find young men and women participating in the programs, talking of new experiments being carried on, new things being done, demonstrating their own interest by what they are doing. In the Interpretation sections we are content to discuss the vagaries of interpretation, impersonation, and acting in the same dull, listless fashion of twenty years ago. No wonder young people are not bringing new life and enthusiasm to such a discussion. Those who are the program leaders seem to think that there are no new topics to discuss, no fields of importance in which we can make progress.

In our school, county, and state contests, we go on having declamation contests with memorized and acted selections. Good teachers of interpretation rise up in indignation only to be subdued eventually by the inertia of the majority who find it easier to sponsor than to fight for real interpretative reading. The good teacher is swamped by those who prefer the old methods designed to win a contest rather than demonstrate effective and good interpretation. And we continue to *act* our poetry! Every few years we flare up in discussion on the subject. It was settled by people who were good teachers thirty years ago, along with the sham battles of impersonation, acting, and interpretation. Let the dead stay buried—and put the dead teachers in with them!

No wonder heads of departments make Interpretation the regulation step-child! Small shock that students skip Interpretation courses entirely when they see no tangible results. Putting one's finger on something tangible is the great builder of interest in speech science. There is no greater satisfaction than to change a lisper into a normal talker within a few days or months. Life has tangible values when a stutterer or a cleft palate case can be made normal, or nearly so, through help.

The effects of remedial speech need not be more tangible than the results of good reading. I have seen students go from a "C" to an "A" average in one term's time when their interest was aroused in reading. I have had high-school students come to me for help, handing me a ponderous tome of poems which was used in an English class to teach poetry. In one instance a teacher had failed a high-school girl because she could not explain what made classical poetry good. The sixteen-year-old looked at me in despair. "I don't even know what the poems mean"; she said, "how can I tell why they are good?" There was nothing more gratifying than the look on her face when she first learned something about rhythm, when, having responded to the rhythm, she learned in part how to read. I shall never forget her first excitement when she turned to me and said in great glee, "Oh, is that what you mean? Oh—oh! Well, I see now what it means!"

I suspect the fault lies in the inertia

of the teacher. Maybe he or she cannot read an example well! True, most teachers are worked too hard, leaving little time for practice in artistic performance. But that is part of the job of teaching. If you are going to be a good teacher of reading, you have to be a good reader or utilize other sources of good reading.

In the scientific aspects of speech, there are tangible experiments, there are even human beings on whom one can work, and who can be seen after they are helped. What are we giving the reader as tangible results? Two activities may be used as examples.

The Reading Hour is one. How many schools have a regular reading hour program? What percentage of schools with radios use readers as regular performers on programs presented? How does the school as a whole, and the community in general, know what the students can do by way of interpretative reading if they are not heard? The regular school reading hour, occurring every two or three weeks, can be supplemented by the Speaker's Bureau in which readers ought to have an active part. Do you have readers reading on school and community programs, fulfilling their function in the life of the school, bringing to people literature which they will miss if not presented in this fashion?

Suitable material is one of the problems here. Teachers allow themselves to be immersed in so many other problems that they do not stay up-to-date on materials available. The ordinary high-school teacher has had no training in how to find material, nor how to cut and adapt it for reading purposes. She is perforce content to use shoddy "canned" material from obvious sources. The new and vital in poetry and prose lies neglected while we follow the road of least resistance and boys appear regularly in contests punishing "My Last Duchess," while girls murder Amy Lowell's "Patterns." Their teacher has not been taught how to find or adapt or use new and suitable material.

The second activity in which interpretation experts can participate with tangible results and in which they can be as scientific as any other speech field is the Reading Clinic. Usually the English departments have sponsored the few that have been attempted. For good or ill, all the work has been done in silent reading. Nobody has experimented with what can be done with poor readers if they get special training in oral reading. Nor has any group of interpretation teachers insisted on the importance of such work.

It is high time to stop arguing and wasting time and to be up and doing. Interpretation is basic to reading script for radio uses, to reading lines for dramatic rehearsals, to quoting excerpts in public speaking, to finding out what is said by those who have lived more widely than the reader, to richness in living. Matthew Arnold once said in answer to Huxley's demand that science be given precedence over literature, that science is primarily concerned with only two of the four powers necessary to contribute to building up human life, intellect and knowledge; whereas literature embraces the power of conduct, the power of intellect and knowledge, the power of beauty, and the power of social life and manners. At the same time it seeks to relate them one to another in the total life of man.

Interpretation is an art and a science. We must work at it from both angles. Its "intangibility" is merely an alibi for those possessed with inertia, and for those content to be second-best (or even third-best) teachers.

SUGGESTIONS FOR A SUCCESSFUL SPEECH CORRECTION PROGRAM IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

STANLEY AINSWORTH
Indiana State Teachers College

THIS article is designed for three groups of people—those teachers who are wondering what a branching out into speech correction work would involve; those who would like suggestions for increasing the efficiency of their present speech correction programs; and students in training.

Articles describing administrative setups for speech correction have appeared in several journals. These have been extremely helpful in offering suggestions for the over-all organization of a program; but it has occurred to me that many details have come in for very little discussion. This paper presents my experience with some of the aspects which can do so much toward making or breaking a speech correction program. Many of the things may seem too obvious to warrant elaboration; but observation has led me to believe that they are often ignored in practice, principally because of lack of appreciation of their importance and paucity of specific techniques for obtaining the desired cooperation and system.

Public Relations

Many people are uncertain as to the character of the position of the speech correctionist in the school system. Where does she fit in? Is she supervisor or teacher? Who is her "boss"? What authority does she have? Of course, generalized answers to these questions are of doubtful value because the particular administrative organization varies tremendously from school to school. In large systems, a supervisor of speech correction often directs other teachers of speech correction or supervises the work of part-time classroom teachers. In smaller schools, the supervisor may do all the work herself. In still others, the speech clinician is a visiting teacher. I believe that better programs may be developed if the speech correctionist is a supervisor rather than a teacher. The rank serves to protect her from imposition by this, that, and the other principal or elementary supervisor. The administrative freedom allows her to build a program unshackled by traditional concepts of the way things "should" be done—just because they always have—and therefore she avoids the unpleasantness of being placed under someone who has very little insight into the particular problems involved. Salary levels and limits are better with this rating and will attract superior teachers. Whenever possible, then, a rating of supervisor should be insisted upon in setting up a new program; but whatever the rating, awareness of the exact position one holds in the school system can go a long way toward dissipating uncertainties which may be the source of misunderstandings.

These suggestions are not intended as a criticism of the excellent work being done by many clinicians with the rating of teacher; but in a period when many schools are setting up correction programs for the first time, it would be well to exert every influence that would aid in developing the most promising and efficient organization possible.

Once the program is under way, the clinician is faced with the problem of working with a large number of teachers. From the point of view of the classroom teacher, much of the work of the speech correctionist comes as an interruption in

"necessary" routine. Whether or not this is true in all cases at all times is not important, but if the speech teacher will work on this assumption, she will be more apt to develop techniques which will do the most in "selling" the correction program to the school and community. I doubt if there is any other one factor as important in establishing and carrying on a good program as that of teacher-clinician relationships. And since speech correction is the interloper, so to speak, the clinician *must assume the responsibility for taking the initiative in making suitable contacts and in keeping others informed as to her contributions to the school system.* The only sound basis for establishing and maintaining the necessary satisfactory public relations is to acquaint teachers with *what* you are *doing*, and to give them ample opportunity to learn *what kind of person* you are.

There are several devices for putting this general advice into practice. By far the most important method is to *talk to the teachers individually.* Take time to see each one as frequently as possible. Nothing can take the place of personal contact in making your program fit smoothly into the school curriculum and in securing the wholehearted cooperation of the classroom teacher. Get to the school early and talk to the teachers before school and during recess periods. This is the only way to give *usable* and *specific* instructions as to how they can help the child with a speech defect without materially increasing their teaching load. Use the time to instruct them about speech disorders, to acquaint them with the special vocabulary you will be using, and to get to know them as persons. Whenever a misunderstanding develops, go promptly and directly to the source in person. Be sure to approach such an interview with a sincere desire to make any adjustments that will work for the betterment of the child or the school. In face of such an attitude and method, very few differences will remain unsettled.

Another device is to send *written reports.* (Specific forms for reports and records will be discussed later.) Although these are never an adequate substitute for visits with the teachers, they are a necessary addition to the total program. Every teacher should receive individual reports concerning each case in her room. It is a wise administrative plan to avoid sending out reports on all cases at set intervals—the burden of doing so is too great—but rather, report on any individual case whenever there is anything of importance to put on record. If a convenient form is worked out for doing this, the saving in time will encourage frequent use of such reports and will enable the teacher to interpret them more easily.

Instruction sessions may be valuable in getting a program off to a good start. These may be carried on in a series form—a few minutes used at four or five regular teachers' meetings—or in a period set aside particularly for this instruction. At the beginning of my second year in public-school speech correction, I inaugurated a series of three two-hour lectures on speech correction to be held in a central place for the whole district. The teachers from the kindergarten through the third grade were especially requested to come, after previous discussion of the plan with them and their principals. All other teachers and the school principals were invited. Attendance was far above expectations and great strides were made in extending the influence of the department. In another situation it might have been better to do the same thing on a smaller and less formal basis.

Another good rule to follow is to *attend regular teachers' meetings* as

often as possible. To speak bluntly, many teachers consider such attendance as a waste of time and a period of scarcely endurable boredom. For teachers who spend all their time in one building, there may be some justification for such an attitude; but for a speech correction teacher who spends no more than two half-days a week in one place, these meetings are the only sure method of becoming acquainted with immediate and localized problems of policy and practice. Attending these meetings is even more important for teachers who go into correction work without previous classroom experience. Moreover, your appearance at these meetings will do much to establish yourself as one of the group, an integral part of the unit which devotes many hours toward developing socially adequate individuals. The interaction of this sense of oneness is a definitely powerful factor in the maintenance of an efficient organization.

Arrange for teachers to *make observations* of your work with individuals or groups from their rooms. This means to go further than issuing general or even individual invitations. It means that you must set specific times and, if necessary, change your schedule to meet the convenience of the classroom teacher.

Principals, as well as classroom teachers, should receive planned attention from the speech correctionist. The pattern of this attention should be similar —written reports and conversations—but with certain specific differences. Written summaries should be prepared for the principal. He should, as well, have an opportunity to see the individual case reports. This may be done either by having the case reports distributed through the principal's office or by having the teachers give them to the principal. I prefer the former procedure because the principal is more apt actually to read the reports which he is responsible for sending out than those which he receives at odd times.

Again, "just talking" cannot be stressed too much. If you can do so without interrupting teaching or other work—for, of course, it is possible to make a pest of yourself!—see the principal for at least a moment or so every time you go to the building. The reason for this is obvious. Constructive and unemotional criticism is seldom given to strangers—a category in which you will remain unless you give the principal adequate opportunity to know you and to learn about your program. The speech correctionist must *never* fall into the attitude expressed by, "Well, I'm here every week. If he wants to know what is going on, he can come and find out. I asked him to." On the contrary, you must go out of your way to provide opportunities —by issuing special invitations to the principal to observe you at work, by regular discussion of cases with him, and by being sure that he comprehends the scope of your program. Even principals who are anxious to cooperate are often handicapped by a lack of specific information about speech correction; and regardless of what he "should" be doing about it, it is the responsibility of the clinician to make sure that he *does* understand.

Furthermore, the principal often has a wealth of knowledge about the familial, social, and economic backgrounds of the children. This efficient means of gaining insight into an individual case should be exploited to the utmost and can be done only by giving the principal frequent opportunities to talk to you.

Another obvious factor is often ignored or forgotten by speech correctionists. Changes of programs or policy in a building should never be made without first outlining and discussing your ideas with the principal. He is responsible

for what goes on in any department in the whole building. Any thoughtless intrusion is rightfully resented.

Although the speech teacher's relationship to her immediate superior—either supervisor or superintendent, as the case may be—may be somewhat formal, the same general approach should be used with him as with the principal. *Keep him informed* by means of *brief, frequent* reports. Make it easy for him to be aware of the types and numbers of the things you are doing. In some systems, this type of report will be set up for you; in others, there are no requirements. Where there is no special form for reporting, the correctionist has the greatest opportunity to adopt her own form and through it to present her program as an efficiently-run, important contribution to the school system.

Parents should receive at least one report a year. A combination form letter and individual report seems to be very satisfactory. During the year, send out any mimeographed or printed materials you have prepared but always accompany these by a clear letter of explanation for specific use, unless the parent receives the material as part of a conference with you.

It can readily be seen that the basic approach to the creation and maintenance of good public relations is that of developing and using all possible avenues for keeping teachers, principals, superintendents, and parents informed of your aims and activities. The particular devices which are most helpful are written reports, schedules, formal and informal personal conferences, and observations of your work. Conferences are time-consuming and often difficult to manage, but they pay huge dividends. The burden imposed by written reports and records can be mitigated to an astonishing degree by a carefully planned system of record keeping.

Record Keeping

Many of my suggestions regarding the establishment of good public relations in a speech correction program are likely to remain unusable unless there are specific ways of implementing the suggestions. My purpose now is to present a plan for carrying out a system of reporting to teachers, principals, and others in an efficient manner, one in which there is adequate coverage without undue burden on the speech correction teacher. Furthermore, in order to maintain any department on a businesslike basis, it is necessary to have an exhaustive—but not exhausting—method of keeping records from which accurate reports may be summarized. All too frequently such a "system" just "grows." The proposed plan is not offered as "ideal"; it is presented merely as a sound basis on which a clinician can build a thoroughly adequate system to fit the local situation. For this reason, basic *types* of record forms will be given with an indication of the materials they should include. The exact format and additions or varying emphases will be dictated by personal preferences and the organization of the program. Sample forms are not included, but I have used several different forms for each type discussed. In other words, the "plan" grew from felt needs in actual situations. The organization of the various record and report forms into a unified whole came as the result of a personal dislike for any more record keeping than necessary, and from the need for teaching such clinical procedures to college students.

Under each general division of the filing system, there will be a discussion of the content of the various forms needed to round out an adequate record-keeping and report-making system.

Case Records are the most immediate concern. The ease with which they let us know who needs help and for what

reasons is the primary measure of their efficiency. If a folder of the case is kept, one should find an increasingly detailed picture of the individual as one goes deeper into the file. At the front of the folder, there should be a summary of the case—an abbreviated picture of the child which shows *who* he is, *what* is wrong, and the *amount* of treatment he has had. It may well be labeled *Summary Record,* and the following four distinct divisions of information in the *Summary Record* should be provided for on one sheet:

1. Routine Identification: name, age, sex, date examined, parents and address, school, grade, room number, teacher, and examiner.
2. Speech Deviations: sound substitutions, lisping, voice, stuttering, indistinctness, dialect, and a place for noting severity of these disorders.
3. Extra Deviations and Test Records: oral and other physical deformities and deficiencies, hearing loss; defects of vision, reading, writing, spelling, personality, and muscular coordination; test results of intelligence, sound discrimination, auditory memory span, laterality, and achievement.
4. Summary of Treatment: dates, number and type of lessons, results, and general remarks.

Spaces for the above information may easily be provided for on one side of a mimeographed sheet. Keep in mind that this is a summary record, not a detailed presentation. The sheet may be used for keeping survey records as well as active and inactive case records.

A *Case History* is needed for some cases. (Not for all—the *Summary Record* will contain all data necessary for the treatment of many pupils.) There are two general types of case history forms. The first is the detailed questionnaire which, if thorough and simple enough, may be filled out by anyone who knows or can get the information. The other is the suggestive-heading type, which may be used by those experienced in case-history taking and is merely an organized way of recording information obtained in an interview. Most sample case histories are a combination of these two extremes. Whatever an individual may prefer, the following order and grouping of data will be found useful:

1. Routine Identification: similar to Summary Record.
2. Description of Deviation: type and severity of disorder.
3. Personal Data: leisure activities and interests, reading, present sleeping and feeding habits, social traits, emotional traits, work habits, handedness preference, attitudes—toward self, others, and situations—temperament, cooperativeness, discipline, delinquency, additional talents or deficiencies.
4. Developmental Data: walking, talking, teething, bladder and bowel control, sleeping and feeding problems, height and weight gain, age of dressing and feeding self.
5. Medical History: diseases, injuries, inoculations, health, defects, coordination.
6. School History: grade, progress, teacher-child relationships, subjects causing difficulty, special talents, playground problems, parent-teacher situation, type and size of school, attendance, schools attended.
7. Home Environment: size, type, location, facilities, neighborhood, companions.
8. Immediate Family History: names and ages of father, mother, siblings—place in family group; deficiencies and disorders of speech, hearing, reading, and mental or emotional diseases; attitudes toward case—attempted therapy; emotional factors in home.
9. Additional Family History: mental and physical disorders or social problems in grandparents, cousins, uncles, and aunts.
10. Summary, comments, and recommendations.

For the recording of specific information, some other types of record forms may be found useful but not necessary. Standardized psychological and other

tests provide their own forms. In addition, the speech correctionist might wish to add an *Articulation Test Record, Medical Report, Handedness Preference Record;* for young children, a *Laterality Index;* for older children, an *Attitude Test;* for stutterers, an *Index of Recordings.* If recordings are made, an *Index of Recordings* is necessary. The best method is to label and file the *discs by number* and to file the *cards by name* of the individual recorded. The 3 x 5 cards should contain the name on the top line. On the next line will appear as heads of vertical columns, date of recording, number of disc, side, strip, size of disc, and speed and direction of recording. Information concerning the first and subsequent recordings will be filled in under these headings. This is the only record form which may be filed more conveniently outside the case folder. The *Summary Record* should contain dates of recordings.

Another important record to be kept is the *Reports* made for principal, supervisor, teacher and parent. The same report form may usually be used for superintendent, supervisor, and principals. This may be entitled *Summary Report.* The following basic information should be on it:

1. Number of pupils being given speech lessons at the beginning of the month (or other report period).
2. Number of pupils dropped during the month.
3. Number of pupils added during the month.
4. Number of pupils being given speech lessons at the end of the month.
5. Extra work to report—speech examinations, speech improvement classes, talks given, etc.

The "number of pupils" items should be in a column at the right. By providing sufficient space below these statements, this form may be adapted for both the superintendent and the principal. For the superintendent (or supervisor), under number added or dropped, you can list types of cases, their numbers, and reasons for dropping. Under extra work, tell the number of interviews, the number of individual reports made, etc. He is interested in a brief, over-all summary of your work, not in details. The principal, on the other hand, should be given the names of pupils in his school, as well as their grade, defect, and reason for dropping. Extra work reported should deal with what was done in his school. *Carbons of these reports should be retained* by the speech correctionist.

A different report form should be developed to be given to teachers and parents. This may be called *Individual Report* (or *Case Report*—although some feel that it is well to avoid use of the term "case.") A satisfactory one should include spaces for the following: Date, period covered, pupil's name, school, teacher, grade, disorder, speech schedule —periods per week, length of period, number of speech classes attended during period covered, specific work done, results, recommendations and remarks, and clinician's signature. Carbons of this report should be filed in the child's folder. If desired, a different form may be developed for sending reports to parents, but a carbon copy of the above teacher's report is quite satisfactory.

A third type of printed or mimeographed material is necessary for the best speech correction program. These materials may be classified under *Informational Bulletins.* Obviously, the number and kinds of these could be almost infinite. But it is my opinion that two kinds are *needed.* The first is a *Classification and Description of Speech Defects.* This should be written in a simple, nontechnical style and given to teachers and occasionally to parents. It is the simplest

way to get across to a great many individuals just exactly what kind of work you are prepared to do. It also aids in acquainting them with some of the specialized vocabulary you will need to use. Such a classification should be on the basis of *symptoms*—what the teacher hears the child doing—and should avoid a discussion of *causes* except for incidental mention in relation to special defects such as cerebral palsy and cleft palate.

The other necessary *Informational Bulletin* is one which may be called *For Parents and Teachers of Young Stutterers.* This may be a list of "Do's and Don't's" or an extended discussion of important factors. It should be carefully worked out to present a picture consistent with the clinician's point of view regarding stuttering and should be written as simply as possible.

Additional bulletins on various aspects of remedial procedures are excellent public relations media. The types and extent depend largely on the imagination and energy of the correctionist. The best way to handle such a group of bulletins is to plan a unified series, one issue of which is published each week or month. They should include simply stated information relating to the causes, characteristics, and correction of specific defects.

In lieu of a summary, it might be best to present an outline of the *basic* forms needed for an adequate record-keeping system and for implementing good public relations by means of reports.

I. Case Records
   - A. *Summary Record*
   - B. *Case History*
   - C. Additional Records

II. Reports
   - A. *Summary Report*—for superintendent, supervisor, principals
   - B. *Individual Report*—for teachers, parents, and case files

III. Informational Bulletins
   - A. *Classification and Description of Speech Defects*
   - B. *For Parents and Teachers of Young Stutterers*
   - C. Additional bulletins on various aspects of remedial procedures

A program using the above suggestions will be well along the road toward sound organization. Individual tastes and local situations will demand additions and changes but very few subtractions will be practicable.

THE SEMANTIC ASPECTS OF STUTTERING IN NON-STUTTERERS: ADDITIONAL DATA

JESSE J. VILLARREAL
The University of Texas

IN THE February, 1942 issue of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, Voelker[1] presented the results of an investigation of the occurrence of stuttering vocabulary in non-stutterers. Such data is significant in evaluating the hypothesis that stuttering may be profitably regarded as a semantogenic disorder.[2]

The group studied by Voelker consisted of 56 males and 40 females. The present study is a repetition of Voelker's procedure with a group of 271 persons,

[1] Charles H. Voelker, "On the Semantic Aspects of Stuttering in Non-Stutterers," QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, XXVIII (1942), 78-80.

[2] Wendell Johnson, *Language and Speech Hygiene: An Application of General Semantics.* Institute of General Semantics (Chicago, 1939).

154 males and 117 females. Every effort was made to reproduce the conditions of the original inventory.

The questionnaire consists of the following six questions:

(1) Did you ever have a stuttering defect of speech?

(2) Did anyone ever call you a stutterer?

(3) Did anyone ever say you were stuttering?

(4) Do you think you ever said anything stutteringly?

(5) Do you think you have a habit of stuttering?

(6) Did you ever call yourself a stutterer?

Those who aided in gathering the present data were given the following directions:

(1) The answers to the six questions are to be secured from your class without discussion as to the significance of the questions, except for the specific directions given here.

(2) Have each student take out a sheet of paper, indicate his sex at the top, and number from one to six down the side of the sheet.

(3) Answers to the questions are to be given in the following form: a plus sign for "yes," and a minus sign for "no." No other mark is permissible.

(4) Tell the students to answer the way nearest to the truth to the best of their memory. They are not to ask what a question "means," but are to answer according to what the question means to them, as best they can make it out.

(5) Students are to be asked to keep their eyes on their own papers so as not to be influenced by the answers of the behavior of any of the other students.

(6) After the papers are handed in, discard the papers of any stutterers. If you are doubtful about any student, throw his paper out. The papers kept are to be only the papers of the students you feel confident are non-stutterers.

The results of this investigation correspond very closely to those reported by Voelker, as the following summary indicates:

	VOELKER'S DATA			PRESENT DATA		
	Total Cases 96	*Male* 56	*Female* 40	*Total Cases* 271	*Male* 154	*Female* 117
1. Have had a stuttering defect of speech	10.4	9.4	1.0	14.0	8.4	5.6
2. Have been called a stutterer	4.2	4.2	0.0	6.7	4.4	2.3
3. Have been said to have been stuttering	30.2	20.8	9.4	29.1	19.5	9.6
4. Thought they had spoken stutteringly	72.9	39.6	33.3	76.0	41.1	34.9
5. Thought they still had the habit	1.0	1.0	0.0	1.8	1.4	.4
6. Had called themselves a stutterer	6.3	4.2	2.1	9.9	5.0	4.9

Further Analysis of Results

(1) Voelker reported that all who answered that they had "called themselves a stutterer" had "spoken stutteringly"; but to have "spoken stutteringly" had no causal relation to "calling self a stutterer." The present results are the same. All who answered plus to No. 6 also answered plus to No. 4; but 66% of those answering plus to No. 4 did not answer plus to No. 6.

(2) Voelker reported that 8.4% to whom "someone said they were stuttering" did not believe they had "said anything stutteringly." But 91.6% who "had been said to have been stuttering" did believe they had "spoken stutteringly." In the repetition, figures of 8.6% and 92.4% were obtained.

(3) Voelker reported that of those who believed they had outgrown a "stuttering defect of speech," (a) 40% remembered "having been called a stutterer"; (b) 20% "had called themselves a stutterer." The present data differs somewhat here, with the two percentages closer together, and the direction of the inequality reversed. Figures of (a) 31.6% and (b) 39.4% were obtained.

(4) Voelker reported that of those admitting "having had a stuttering defect of speech," (a) 30% added *only* that they had "spoken stutteringly," marking the rest of the items "minus." (b) 20% said they "had been told they were stuttering" *and* that they belived had "called themselves a stutterer." (c) Another 20% *added to this* that they had been "called a stutterer." (d) 10% *added also* that they "had called themselves a stutterer." (e) *And another* 10% said they thought they still "had a habit of stuttering." Results in the present inventory were (a) 18.4%, (b) 21%, (c) 18.4%, (d) 10.5%; (e) nobody in this group added that he thought he still had the habit.

(5) Voelker reported that 90% of those who had had the "defect" had had "people say that they were stuttering." And *all* of these that had had the "defect" believed that they "had spoken stutteringly." Figures of (a) 79% and (b) *all* were obtained here.

(6) Voelker reported that 72% of nonstutterers believed "they had spoken stutteringly," with no indication of a sex difference. Twice as many males reported "to have been said to have been stuttering" as females. In the present report, a figure of 76% was obtained. And almost exactly twice as many males reported "to have been said to have been stuttering" as females.

TELEVISION AND HIGH-SCHOOL DRAMATICS

EDWARD STASHEFF
New York City

AND NOW . . . or at most tomorrow afternoon . . . television! Just when we have mastered to a considerable degree the problems of teaching radio techniques in our dramatics or separate radio classes, just when we have established cordial relations with program directors and managers of local radio stations, just when our students are beginning to justify our fondest hopes in their performances on the air-waves, television must rear its iconoscope!

But surely, you say, we need not concern ourselves with television techniques just yet! Today there are only nine television stations operating in all America: three in New York, two in Chicago, two in Los Angeles, one in Philadelphia and one in Schenectady! True, true, but there are over 100 applications for stations now pending with the Federal Communications Commission, with prospective station owners waiting impatiently for WPB permission to begin construction. As this is written, three sites have been chosen in Washington, D.C., alone! And let us not forget that the limited radius of television bids fair to provide many small independent stations, each keenly interested in making the most of local (and unpaid) talent to fill the voracious maw of the rehearsal-hungry cameras.

When to this exhilarating thought we add the conservative prediction of one of our foremost manufacturers of equipment that "18 months after Victory will find television service available to

30,000,000 people, with enjoyment limited only by plant capacity of set manufacturers," and the promise of another manufacturer (already fulfilled in pilot models) of television screens ranging from 18 x 24 inches on up, we are faced with the realization that television already has one foot around that corner. True, the whole industry is still in a fluid state and production techniques are far from crystallized, but high-school and college teachers of dramatics will do well to look into the matter before too long. The auditorium-size receiver, with projection screen, and the mobile unit which will visit our own auditoriums to pick up our prize productions are nearer than we think!

Realization of this factor has not been wanting. The Yale School of the Drama recently became the first educational institution to join the Television Broadcasters Association. From New York State Mr. Max Bildersee reports that high school students in Schenectady are facing the cameras in General Electric's WRGB studios with a fair degree of regularity. And in New York City, we have boldly added television techniques to our most advanced course in radio production.

For several years, talented students from New York City's 54 academic and 26 vocational high schools have been auditioned regularly for membership in the All-City Radio Workshop, an extra-curricular group which met for training, rehearsals, and broadcasts in the WNYE studios, located atop the building of the Brooklyn Technical High School. These pupils participated in educational broadcasts for the schools. In September, 1944, the Board of Education set up six advanced courses, carrying credit, in collaboration with the National Broadcasting Company. The six courses were Radio Theory, Broadcast Station Operation, and Sound Recording, for the engineering students; Script Writing, Acting, and Radio Production for the nontechnical students.

The earlier work had been carried on by James F. Macandrew and Van Rensselaer Brokhahne, of the program staff, and William Pabst, Technical Director of the station, aided by three teacher engineers. The inauguration of the new and more advanced program caused the assignment of additional personnel to the faculty, who in addition to teaching the six advanced courses listed above, and serving as producers or engineers for an augmented program of 23 broadcasts a week, were available for teaching duties in the English Department of Brooklyn Technical High School. Under the chairmanship of Daniel J. Cahill, elementary or "feeder" courses in Radio Appreciation, Elementary Production, and Elementary Script Writing were set up in the lower grades, with admission to the advanced work restricted to pupils in the last year.

Scarcely had the new series of courses been instituted when it became apparent, in the course of field trips to television stations WABD, WNBT, and WCBW, that the curriculum was incomplete without a consideration of television. But the teaching of television, and the provision of opportunities for students in the All-City Workshop to go before the cameras became only one aspect of the investigation of the potentialities of television. At the present writing, the Board of Education and the Television Department of the Columbia Broadcasting System are cooperating in four fields:

1. Enrichment of the teaching program at Station WNYE through the appearance of guest lecturers from CBS, and through pupil visits to WCBW's studios.
2. Experimentation with carefully selected, highly visualized "lessons," specially prepared for television by teachers (chiefly of science) of the Brooklyn Technical High School.

3. Evaluation of such broadcast "lessons" by student groups, chosen to represent a cross-section of the pupil population of the city. Students will observe the lesson on presently available receivers, under simulated classroom conditions.
4. Regular appearance of the members of the All-City Radio and Television Workshop (yes, we had to change the title) on a monthly CBS program, There Ought to Be a Law, broadcast from Station WCBW.

At first glance it may appear that only the first and the last venture fall within the province of the speech teacher. Yet, it has been found that "radio lessons" prepared by a subject-matter expert with no radio training fall short of complete effectiveness. By working out "teams" of one subject-matter expert and one production specialist, we have evolved more interesting, more dramatic lessons. Similarly, utilization techniques, in television as in early radio, bid fair to be advanced most by the group which has most intimate contact with the new medium—the dramatic teachers.

The preparation of student groups for television broadcasts is the most exciting, as it is the most logical, field for the drama coach, and it is that area which has already proved most fruitful in New York. Participation in just one program, a group discussion format in which student "representatives" to a mythical congress discussed "laws" introduced by their own number, taught both students and instructors far more than textbooks, visits, and guest lecturers combined. True, this program (and our students) had the good fortune to work under the guiding hand of Ben Feiner of CBS Television, a patient and understanding director with a football coach's talent for whipping youngsters into a last-minute touchdown spirit which carried the broadcast safely through the goal posts month after month. True, also, the series attracted much hyperbolic critical acclaim from the *Billboard* and pleased CBS officials so that the students were asked to continue the series through the summer. But the preliminary work of selection and preparation is still, in New York, and likely to remain, everywhere, the province and the problem of the school directors of dramatics and radio. It is for them that the next pages, containing the first fruits of these enlightening experiences on the studio floor and in the control room are offered here—with no little diffidence.

Let me repeat that it grows increasingly evident that until commercial sponsors provide the funds for extended rehearsals of professional programs (and perhaps for some time after) there will be air time to be filled by institutional and audience participation programs. Few nonprofessional sources of talent can compete with the classrooms of America, with the freshness, the spirit, the photogenic qualities of our students. The wise teacher will be laying plans at once to ensure cooperation with his local television station, which will result in profitable ventures for pupils, public, and professional operators as well.

As for public service broadcasting, which will be the concern of television, fully as much as of radio, it will lean heavily upon educational programs. With best listening-and-looking hours between 8 and 10 P.M., and with an audience, by and large, of high-school graduates, the average educational program will be directed toward the classroom by day, toward the junior college level at night. In either event, the audience will be of an educational composition with which we are familiar, and we can be of great service to television broadcasters in the years which must pass before linked stations make possible network programs of the calibre of the Columbia School of the Air or the NBC InterAmerican University of the Air.

The need is evident. The preparation is a bit frightening. Yet, by and large, any really competent dramatic coach who has had radio experience as well, with an ideal dash of amateur movie-making in his past, can contribute to television if he is willing to put himself and his students, in technical matters, in the hands of the professional producer who is assigned to his program.

Several very fine courses in television production have already been set up in institutions of higher learning, and no doubt summer sessions will find increased numbers of us flocking to the centers fortunate enough to provide such facilities. Meanwhile a few of the simplest, most elementary, frequently obvious bits of learning which have come to this writer in the course of his efforts in the field may be helpful to the next fellow.

First let us realize that our audience is not composed of friends and relatives, as it almost always is in the student theatre and frequently is on the air. Let us therefore avoid trying to do with amateurs what can be done better with professionals; let us not try to do with children what adults clearly should be doing. Amateurs *should* be able to do well in television, since they can afford the long hours of rehearsal (out of the studio) which would be too expensive when attempted on a professional scale. Yet many amateur television programs have failed simply because they attempted material beyond the scope of the young amateur.

Let us instead capitalize on our best assets: the youth, the spontaneity and effervescence, the heart-touching sincerity of our pupils. Let them be themselves whenever possible and let us steady the boat with a teacher or a professional when one or two older elements must be injected. Let us consider the assembly format, in which we invite the television audience to enter the school in order to see what their children and our pupils are presenting for their peers.

Ambition was Caesar's downfall—to say nothing of Napoleon's and Hitler's—and overmuch ambition may be ours. Before attempting an elaborate production, it is wise to check with the local station's production department on the practicability of our plans for settings, the videogenic qualities of the costumes we hope to use, the problems of make-up. (The less the better, in general, although girls who use a fairly heavy pancake base, with pencil help on eyebrows, and a dark lipstick may be quite in order. Be guided in this, as in all things, by your local production man. And don't hope for the familiar stage miracle which will convert seventeen-year-old Jimmy into Grandpaw!)

Once we have made contact with the local people, have submitted a possible program, and have set a date, let's be sure to get our cast over to watch a rehearsal of some other production. Then, with our youngsters aware of the general studio setup, let us simulate it on the school stage or studio floor, and rehearse in that frame of reference. Frequent liaison missions during the rehearsal period will prevent heart-breaking changes on THE DAY.

And when THE DAY finally comes, let us get our casts down to the station well ahead of time for preliminary instruction and possible noncamera run-through in a convenient anteroom or lobby. Use of actual facilities is limited, expensive, and strictly rationed among the competing programs, no one of which ever gets enough camera or rehearsal.

Let us be sure to have clearance cards or releases, usually furnished by the station, duly signed by the students themselves and by the parents of those under twenty-one. The Civil Rights Law requires the consent of the person concerned and of his guardian before a

photograph or likeness, name, and biographical material can be distributed to the general public. Such a statement of consent does not extend to the endorsement of any product or service. It is well to have these cards filled in and collected in advance, just as it is well to have the station write into the opening or closing announcement the familiar statement that in discussion programs assertions made by students represent only their own opinions, and do not commit school or educational system.

There will be a dozen other matters to check on, but the helpful producer (and this writer has met no other variety) will suggest them, just as Gilbert Seldes, Leo Hurwitz, and Ben Feiner of CBS, have dinned these into my willing head. In the conventional disclaimer, I add that any merit in my suggestions stems from their kindness; any errors are mine.

A COURSE IN SPEECH TRAINING FOR BUSINESS

RALPH C. LEYDEN
Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri

"THE employer is less concerned with the process of education and more with the functional results of education as observed through the abilities of employees to perform the duties expected of them."[1] This need for positive functional results in speech education has been repeatedly expressed by employers whose personnel handle the public in airlines, retail establishments, and offices. Our Vocational Guidance Department at Stephens College has summed up the pleas of employers interviewed who say, "Send us people who are not only trained in the techniques of their jobs, but who can also *talk* pleasingly and effectively." For students who plan to take only a basic course in speech which will more adequately prepare them for employment in business, the functional aspect of speech is particularly important.

The enthusiastic response to Business Speech sections of the Fundamentals of Speech course at Stephens College, by both students and instructors in other fields, indicates that a course in business speech meets definite needs. Students in such special terminal training curricula as business practice, airlines ticketing and reservations, and merchandising have, during the past year, increased the demand for Business Speech sections from the original two sections to seven of sixteen students each.

I

The Fundamentals of Speech course can be well adapted to the many varied speech situations that arise in business associations and at the same time permit, and even motivate more strongly, the improvement of the individual in the elements of speech. This description of the course presents the content and methods used which differ from the usual speech course. Briefly, the units of instuction and performance described below include self-analysis, out-of-class interviews, selection and organization of ideas, telephone practice, sales presentations, application interviews, parliamentary procedure, and evaluation.

The speech needs of these students are similar to the speech needs of most other college freshmen and sophomores. That is, they need to develop self-confidence and bodily poise in speaking situations; they need to learn to organize ideas, to

[1] Earnest C. Fossum, "Speech and Occupational Needs," QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, XXIX (1943), 498.

express the ideas in appropriate language; they need to improve in voice production.

These fundamental needs are met by working toward the following aims and objectives. The list is twofold in nature in that the fundamental elements of speech are attacked both directly and through specific situations requiring the application of the elements of thought, language, voice, and action. These aims are:

1. To recognize the close relationship of speech and personality and to formulate individual programs for the improvement of both.
2. To learn to organize ideas in business conversations, conferences, short explanatory and persuasive talks, and reports.
3. To choose language appropriate to the occasion.
4. To develop self-confidence and poise in speech situations.
5. To improve all aspects of speech production: quality, pitch, volume, distinctness, and rate.
6. To learn to conduct conferences and interviews effectively.
7. To learn to talk over the telephone efficiently and pleasingly.
8. To learn to participate in parliamentary meetings.
9. To learn the essentials of sales presentations.
10. To provide classroom and out-of-class experiences in situations similar to those in the business office and in normal business relationships.

II

The course begins with an introductory unit involving a self-analysis by each student of those traits which appear on many application blanks and rating sheets of large corporations employing many people. Our classes use the *Sample Balance Sheet* by Alfred Huston and Robert A. Sandberg.[2] In addition to the columns of *Assets* and *Liabilities*, however, a third column is added which is titled, *What To Do About It*. A conference with the instructor follows the work on self-analysis.

After the initial self-analysis, students begin a series of out-of-class interviews with members of the faculty. The cooperation of approximately 35 faculty staff members, experienced in employment or in personnel work and from other divisions of the college, make it possible for each student to have a series of three interviews during the year. These interviews provide genuine, not pretended, interview situations. Each student chooses his conferee from the available list because he has a real desire to discuss with him subjects or problems that interest him *now*. These interviews, conducted at the beginning, the middle, and the end of the year, serve several purposes: (1) They give the student the opportunity to gain experience in arranging and conducting interviews and conferences. (2) They provide an opportunity for him to be rated by an "outsider" whose judgment is frank and impersonal. (3) They give the student an opportunity to measure his improvement by comparing his successive ratings.

For the interviews, the student is expected to make his appointment by telephone which gives the person interviewed an opportunity to begin rating the student before seeing him. The student is expected to "dress" for the interview. He is asked to take the initiative as the interviewer during the first and second interviews. At the last interview, the student plays the role of the interviewee and as such is questioned on the course and is given an opportunity not only to evaluate the instruction he has received, but also to give suggestions for the improvement of the course.

A rating scale was finally devised for use in the interviews, but only after trial use of two other scales, the one a personality rating scale, and the other an employment interview scale used by one

[2] Alfred D. Huston and Robert A. Sandberg, *Everyday Business Speech* (1943), pp. 28-29.

of the country's large corporations. Neither of the latter quite served the purposes of improvement. The scale developed is given below.

Having experienced his first interview and analyzed his ratings, and having realized through his own self-analysis and class study the tremendous importance of basic characteristics in business relationships, a student is well on the way

IMPROVEMENT SCALE
(Interview Form)
by Ralph C. Leyden

Observer's Name _____ Student's Name _____

INSTRUCTIONS: Please place a check in the appropriate column opposite each characteristic.

SHOULD I IMPROVE MY:	Outstanding	Good	Acceptable	Needs Attention	No Judgment
1. *APPEARANCE OF*					
Posture?					
Dress?					
Hair?					
Hands?					
Cosmetics?					
Over-all attractiveness?					
2. *COURTESY IN*					
Making appointment?					
Entering room?					
Introducing self?					
Speaking and listening?					
Leaving room?					
3. *INITIATIVE IN*					
Asking questions?					
Directing conversation?					
Closing interview?					
4. *ADAPTABILITY IN*					
Meeting strangers?					
Listening well?					
Answering questions?					
Adjusting to changes of subject?					
Maintaining an open mind?					

SHOULD I IMPROVE MY:	Outstanding	Good	Acceptable	Needs Attention	No Judgment
5. *SPEECH EXPRESSION IN*					
Pleasantness of voice?					
Expressiveness of face?					
Vitality of voice?					
Organization of ideas?					
Pronunciation?					
Distinctness?					
Language choice?					
Over-all tone of interest and courtesy?					
6. *KNOWLEDGE AND IMAGINATION INVOLVED IN*					
Breadth of interests?					
Practical viewpoints?					
Responsiveness to ideas?					
7. *POISE AND PERSONALITY INDICATED BY*					
Pleasantness?					
Sincerity?					
Self-assurance?					
Alertness?					

COMMENTS:

to setting practical goals for himself. He begins to look forward to the second and third interviews to see whether his "rater" will notice improvement.

III

Improvement in the organization and presentation of ideas is handled quite similarly to the usual instruction in a Fundamentals of Speech course. The first approach is through brief presentations of instructions and explanations, later through the preparation and presentation of short explanatory and persuasive talks, and is followed by discussion and concise asking and answering of questions in conference groups of three to five students.

Improvement in voice is first approached through voice analysis tests using Grant Fairbanks' *Speech Sound Inventory Blank*.[3] Students needing special help are sent to the Speech Clinic. Other students with similar needs attend special help classes. Class drill is accompanied by study of speech recordings and drill with the aid of a magnetic wire recorder and the Mirrophone. As soon as the foundations in voice improvement have been laid, progress is continued in a teaching unit on the use of the telephone in business. This unit provides not only a motivation for improvement of all the factors of voice, but also of attitudes that please listeners. It provides practical attention to the choice of appropriate language. Students learn that employers want employees who are friendly, courteous, helpful, and pleasant in customer relations as well as employees who can give exact information that meets the customer's needs. In this unit students hear their recorded telephone speech; they hold many practice conversations over telephone equipment; they study industrially prepared pamphlets in telephone usage, hear recordings of good telephone usage in everyday business situations, and see films presenting telephone techniques that promote good customer relations.

A unit on sales presentations provides still another opportunity for the application of the fundamentals training. It not only provides an adaptation of persuasive speech techniques, but also serves as an introduction to a subsequent unit on the job application or personal interview application. Students prepare and present promotional sales talks as well as give personal sales demonstrations. In the classroom students occasionally sell articles which they might otherwise dispose of through the campus "Swap Shop."

Subsequent to learning the techniques of selling articles is the learning and practicing of selling their own services through job applications. Job and company analyses are made; letters of application are studied and written; personal data sheets are prepared. Several classroom interviews are presented. Students act as employers and employees, analyzing their own presentations and those of others. Classes are combined and students are interviewed by strangers. Finally other faculty members from the Vocational Guidance Department come into the classroom to interview students as they may expect to be interviewed by a variety of personnel managers. Preparatory to these final job applications, each student presents to the interviewer his letter of application and personal data sheet containing his present qualifications for a specific job. Every opportunity is thus taken to give students immediate application of their course material.

For the students in the classes who want summer employment or employ-

[3] Grant Fairbanks, *Practical Voice Practice* (1944), p. 3.

ment upon graduation, the real test of their study and practice comes when they actually apply for jobs through personnel representatives of aviation, merchandising, and business organizations. Such personnel representatives are brought to campus each spring by the Vocational Guidance Department. When a student has had such an interview he reports to the class on his job application experiences.

The study of parliamentary procedure is introduced early in the year and is used as a framework for the presentation of some of the class work throughout the year. Programs of talks, discussions, and special features such as visiting speakers, are handled by the speech class organized as a business club.

The significance of the course lies in the fact that functional situations have been utilized whenever possible to aid in the learning and application of the fundamentals of speech. Such a course, however, needs constant revision in the light of changing emphases as student needs and needs felt by employers of business personnel change, and as more research in training business personnel is made available. The instructors of such a course must remain open to the suggestions and criticisms of colleagues, students, and employers in order to improve instruction and results.

IV

That such an approach to the teaching of speech does produce positive results is indicated by the comments of some of the participating faculty interviewers following their final interviews with students. It will be remembered that during this final interview the students were interviewed by administrative and faculty personnel on the course itself and on improvement that seemed to have been attained. To quote the Registrar of the college. "If only we could have all students as enthusiastic about their courses as this one, how fine it would be. All of these I interviewed agree that the course is most practical and interesting. They have been eager to learn and improve and have done so." An instructor in secretarial training says, "I think the students have found the speech course one of the most valuable they have had at college." Another comment from the head of the Secretarial Department is, "They are sold on the course, particularly the manner in which situations are created that seem real." The head of the college Research Department states, "With the students, I ran down the list of objectives, particularly the one on the application of what they had learned. In all cases, the opinion was affirmative and enthusiastic. My general impression was very favorable."

THE TEACHER'S VOICE: SHOW-WINDOW OF PERSONALITY

GUSTAVE SCHWAMM
Russell Sage College

THE human voice is one of the most important factors in the educative process. The teacher's effectiveness depends upon richness and variety of tone fully as much as does the actor's. Their respective types of artistry can be given adequate expression only through the development afforded by the instruction and guidance of a qualified speech teacher.

The vocally untrained teacher, prospective or in-service, needs to understand that in the absence of physiological, anatomical, or psychological limitations he possesses a reasonably adequate vocal faculty. He needs to be reassured that for the most part the disparity he observes between his skill and that of his favorite radio announcer is to be attributed to differences in training. The teacher needs to be impressed with the availability of expert diagnosis and with the prospects for development if he engages in a program for improvement under the guidance of a competent speech instructor and if he himself exercises the sustained effort essential to make new muscular skills habitual. The teacher, in other words, must understand that the voice is akin to other physical potentialities. Although they differ from person to person, these possibilities of the individual can be realized through the application of personal effort.

How may the teacher in need of this voice training be brought to the point of embarking upon a program for his betterment? In all probability, he needs to be given added insight into the role of voice in the teaching act. He needs, also, special training.

The teacher can easily make himself a despot, a friend, or a completely indifferent individual through vocal usage. Each role he may acquire from habit not from intention; though were he to choose, each teacher would prefer to be the constant friend. Not infrequently he is required to disapprove a statement, an act, or an attitude of his student. When such a moment arises, he may unwittingly convey with his voice a spirit venomous, violent, ugly; this impression is far from the emphatic negation intended. Pupils, however, like other persons, do not ask for motives; they interpret the outward signals. In contrast, if the teacher be skilled in interpersonal relations and voice techniques, he can bring into play infinite vocal resources of flexibility and color that to a faltering pupil will reveal warmth and encouragement. Yet again, the teacher, subject to preoccupation with thoughts remote from the pupil he meets on the street, without wishing to offend, may reply to a morning greeting with tones and manner most frigid.

By the teacher's vocal practices students can be aroused to anger, encouraged into a healthy state of confidence, stirred into meaningful activity, or crushed very cruelly in defeat. Oftentimes these practices are the result of innocence rather than of vicious intent. The listless voice may, for example, arouse one response—if it arouses any! The fresh, energetic voice may evoke another. Furthermore, as every teacher knows, there are times when *special control* over emotion is imperative. Weariness and tension beset the teacher, and both are easily betrayed in voice and manner. Restraint must be exercised in

such circumstances, however difficult, if for no other reason than consideration for students. Control, however, is not instinctive; it must be learned.

The first step in vocal improvement for the teacher is the recognition of the need for a personal appraisal by a specialist in voice and speech. The objectives one should seek in such an appraisal should constitute a report on the range of impressions conveyed in the gamut of the speaker's normal activities. While the speaker may, as a general rule, have opinions as to the effect he creates, he cannot know how he impresses other persons in a variety of situations; it is this report that he needs. He should seek also, some estimate of his vocal behavior, its range and variety of power, rate of enunciation, clarity and conventionality. These things the teacher may never know for himself until he has been favored with the inventory.

The second step is to undertake the voice and speech training that is indicated by the appraisal. The third and final step—too often overlooked by the teacher and the speech specialist himself—is *reappraisal*. Retreat from a corrected habit to its faulty predecessor may take place imperceptibly until the old habit has again become master; hence, the imperative need for an occasional check-up.

It would appear that the pursuit of the suggestions herein can hardly fail to contribute handsomely to the classroom teacher's personal equipment and to enrich the execution of his important functions.

THE FORUM

COMMUNICATION—A STEP FORWARD?

Many proposals for the organization of educational areas and courses are in the wind. The article by Professor Lennox Gray in the April, 1944, QUARTERLY JOURNAL and the June, 1944, report of President Aly in the Speech News Letter serve to focus attention on this planning. The basic ideas in such proposals ordinarily call for various types of functional integration and possible expansion of the programs in Speech and English education. The writer is motivated to call attention to certain very basic considerations for education inherent in such plans.

Speech educators are naturally pleased to receive support in their endeavors from educational colleagues in cognate fields. Most of us do not need to be convinced of the educational values of our professional program. There are still many educators, however, who are woefully uninformed about and unsympathetic toward speech education. This has been made apparent to many of us in our recent contacts with the army educational programs in English. We do have a job to do in the development of public understanding of modern speech education. The key question becomes: *What needs will be met by a merger of forces which cannot be met by independent and cooperative action?*

The "new" proposals are not essentially new to us. Our programs are functional in the best sense of that term. We follow a tradition centuries old, and add to it constantly by experience and research. Our teachers are trained extensively in its methods and problems. Our courses almost universally represent and educate for democracy in action. Experienced in the art of drawing from many educational disciplines in the unification of all knowledge which contributes to the understanding and development of the speaker and his speech, we are not guilty of the charge of departmentalized and fractionated education. And we are also skeptical of glittering generalities. We know the futility and dangers of superficiality. We have had to learn to take responsibilities, and some of us are determined not to violate professional integrity by temporizing with less than the best.

Can teachers of English help us do these things better? Some of us may find it difficult to see in what ways. Can they help give us a better opportunity to work in this manner? Yes, I think so. They recently had an opportunity when the army education office announced its decision to reduce the amount of speech in the Army Specialized Training Program. There is no record of any protest lodged by them against this move and Professor Gray has told us of their earnest cooperation in setting up the original program.

To most speech teachers a functional communications program is essentially a speech program. As has been pointed out by Professor O'Neill, this was true of the first Army Specialized Training Program in English. Reports from a great number of institutions indicate that our English colleagues may not have handled this program with great credit to themselves. Why? Because to our way of thinking, they were not prepared to teach speech. This leads to the second key question I should like to raise: *Does the communications proposal open the*

way to new opportunities for teachers of speech? The answer is yes, if we can exercise the leadership and possess the ability which will make it a success.

Grave doubts have been raised by many educators of the almost universal requirements of secondary school and junior college requirements in English. Why require written composition only, when the techniques of democratic action are so characteristically speech techniques? Let us cooperate in the teaching of communication, but let us insist on the teachers, the program, and the methods which can get results. Our experience may be of help to our colleagues in English instruction who teach writing and literature. Professor Gray and his associates who believe in our program may be of great help to us and to their own colleagues by working for and with us in this respect. Certainly it should not be necessary to organize a new department or division in an already over organized program to get this cooperation. Let us encourage and help him if we can in carrying this message to his associates in the National Council of Teachers of English. Let us agree that communication is a great ideal, and a unifying concept in our work. But let us also recognize that unity is not more important than the job to be done and the willingness to face frankly the work which must be done to achieve it. To insist on less would be to violate our professional trust.

One final question: *Does a program in communication raise new dangers and handicaps to a successful curriculum in speech education?* Professor Gray cites the analogy of the division of humanities. It is a known fact that departments of speech in many institutions where such divisional organization has been carried out have preferred to remain unclassified rather than become a member of any division. Our departments traditionally keep open many interdepartmental lines of contact. Classification within a division would often raise barriers to interdepartmentalism rather than destroy them. Good teachers are the *sine qua non* of successful education. Where teachers can work together successfully, departmentalism is no handicap. Where they cannot, no administrative organization of divisions can force successful cooperation. It is not always necessary for teachers of speech and English to work in the same department to achieve their objectives. In many cases they will continue to get better results by working independently.

In spite of the agreement by some teachers of speech with teachers of English that we work for the same objectives and have no "course content," many of us are of a different mind. Does anyone honestly believe that many of the educational conditions which demanded independence in 1915 do not still exist today? If so, let him consider the number of collegiate institutions which have only recently set up a separate department of speech. If he does not understand this, perhaps he is not after all a teacher of speech. If we are doing the same thing, why are we asked to cooperate in advancing our work? There is certainly no defense for wasteful duplication of educational effort. If there is nothing to teach in speech, what can we coordinate with the program of teachers of English?

This writer does not go along with those teachers of English who declare it was very unfortunate that speech and English became separate disciplines. Speech education has been advanced in the educational world primarily by the imaginative and vigorous pioneering of our efforts. There is little ground for assuming that this will not continue to be true. Whatever programs are devised under the heading of communication should be cooperative programs rather than mergers. Loss of identity of speech education as such is tantamount to loss

of freedom for development and opportunity. We have an opportunity in communications development to continue our growth and service if we maintain those principles of action which have guided us in the past. If we capitulate to those who would run the show without experience and professional right we are indeed unworthy of our task.

In a real sense a half a program in education is often worse than none at all. It provides a pretext by which successful action is impeded and frustrated. When programs of speech education can be demonstrably improved by programs in communication, let us move ahead with speed. When such evidence is lacking, let us not be too quick to share our responsibility with anyone who catches the gleam.

—FRANKLIN H. KNOWER

WHITHER SPEECH?

From the beginnings of recorded history, the story of humanity has been based on mankind's struggle to achieve and maintain a balance between theory and practice. In most instances theory has had to be tested and proven and implemented by practice before it was generally accepted as truth. Great teachers have always recognized the fact that young and beginning students must be shown before they can be expected to believe. Quintilian suggested that the child who was slow in talking be taught with objects. Jesus said, "Oh, ye of little faith!" but He went ahead to supply evidence that His theory or philosophy merited the faith He asked for it. Today we talk of objectification, extensionalization, and the scientific attitude. We are really saying, "We're from Missouri. Show us before we can believe." We are trying to reconcile facts and ideas, theories and practices.

In the teaching of speech or of any other subject matter that demands both comprehension of ideas and acquisition of specific skills, this ageless tug-of-war between ideas and facts is always going on. Perhaps it is in introductory courses in speech that our professional indecision in this matter of whether to emphasize theory or performance is most apparent. Shall we insist on platform excellence? Or, shall we strive to inculcate an appreciation of good speaking? Again, shall we require an understanding of the principles underlying effective speech? In brief, should a first course in speech emphasize teacher-presentation of subject matter or student performance?

To answer these questions, let us examine some of the theory we teach. We say that all speaking, and therefore all teaching, must evoke a response from the listener. I suppose the general response we want from a class is understanding or comprehension; we want to inform or to instruct our hearers. That is not enough. We should also be intent upon interesting, stimulating, convincing, and moving to action. Unless we can evoke, in a class in speech, a more overt response than that of comprehension, we shall have failed. If we want to elicit a response from the class, perhaps the class wants something from us. The question now becomes: What do students want to get out of a speech class that will be, for many of them, the only course they take in the field? For ten consecutive terms I asked every member of my fundamentals classes what they hoped to accomplish by electing (or being elected into!) a course in speech. Over 90 per cent of approximately 400 students replied that they wanted to acquire the ability to get up and talk before a group of people. That is a clear enough answer. Those students want a skill, not a smattering of knowledge. They need to be taught just enough theory to enable them to understand the steps they

are asked to follow in improving their posture, breath control, general appearance, voice, articulation, and ideation. I hope that by the time I'm ready to retire I shall have been able to evolve a course, with the help of successive generations of students, to give them what they want. A first course in speech may be thought of as a course in speech improvement if, of course, we start with the idea and fact that speech is a product of the coordinated activity of the entire body. To teach by precept and example the need for pleasantly audible and intelligible speech and then to encourage each student to use all of his available equipment as efficiently as possible to meet this need is to work toward an ideal balance between theory and practice.

This is all very well for the student who does not plan to go on in speech, you argue, but what of the potential major and the graduate student? Ought they not be given a firm basis in the history and theory of the various phases of our field? I suggest that you listen to your majors and to your graduate students. Do they have pleasing voices? Do they articulate distinctly and accurately? Do they express ideas easily, clearly, and gracefully? Or, do they have an abundance of book knowledge and an inability to secure, hold, and influence an audience? Are they poised and habile on the platform or even in the classroom? Instruct them first, I say, concerning the tools of their trade and the use of these tools. Then, let these potential speech experts learn the history and structure and theories of the tools and their use. A student who has learned to lower the pitch of his own voice is far more interested in studying the structure and action of the larynx, for example, than the student who has never experimened with his own vocal instrument. A student who has engaged in classroom or intramural debate is a more avid student of the Lincoln-Douglas debates than is one who has never attempted a rebuttal speech. The young clinician who has observed and corrected his own speech (and who among us does not need correction from time to time?) is a better student of speech pathology and rehabilitation than the student who has not been asked to pay attention to his own speech performance.

If we teachers are to emphasize speaking as an art and a skill as well as speaking as a science and a body of knowledge, we must take care that the old saw, "If you can't do it, teach it!" cannot be applied to us. A speech teacher who is stressing the need for good speaking ought not read his lectures, mumble his words, fail to look at his students, assume poor posture, speak in an affected voice or manner, or present unorganized materials. If we decide to motivate the student to speak well, we assume the burden of proof. We contract to become what good teachers are and have been—good examples. When we attempt to elicit the proper response from the student, we attempt to lead him to become his own teacher. This Socratic method of teaching is not easy. Not nearly so easy as giving a prepared (perhaps long-prepared) lecture timed to preclude questions! It is, however, exciting to find ourselves eliciting from beginning students the response that nine out of ten of them want to give—the best speech of which each is capable.

If we don't take the trouble to evoke this response, if we don't supply evidence to merit the faith we ask for our theory, we may not have a chance to teach much theory. If we teachers of speech fail to produce better speakers than do teachers in other departments on our campuses, administrations may ask, and justly so: Why speech?

Whither speech? —J.A.

THIRTIETH ANNUAL CONFERENCE

The Thirtieth Annual Conference of the ASSOCIATION will be held in the Deshler-Wallick Hotel, Columbus, Ohio, December 27, 28, and 29. It will be the first conference since 1940 to be held without the shadow of wartime restrictions. The hotel has 1,000 guest rooms and 50 conference rooms; it will not be heavily crowded with service men as hotels will be in Chicago, Cleveland, and New York. The prospect is for better hotel accommodations than it was possible for the ASSOCIATION to secure during the war years.

Meeting with the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH will be four related associations: the American Speech Correction Association, the American Educational Theatre Association, the National Thespian Society, and the National University Extension Association Committee on Debate Materials and Interstate Cooperation. In addition, the Association for Education by Radio is cooperating in the sponsorship of one general session.

Among the convention features will be:

In Educational Radio (F. L. Whan, Chairman) H. B. Summers of the American Broadcasting Company, and Gertrude Broderick of the U. S. Department of Education, plus a panel of ASSOCIATION members, will discuss "The Future of Radio in the Schools."

The Junior Town Meeting League will broadcast its Junior Town Meeting, with Allen Y. King, President of the League, serving as chairman, and C. W. Pettigrew, National Moderator, serving as moderator. Among the panel members for the critique, in addition to ASSOCIATION members, will be E. L. Bousher, superintendent of schools in Toledo, Gordon Hawkins, program and educational director of the Westinghouse Radio Stations, and H. H. Helble, principal of the high school in Appleton, Wisconsin.

The Association for Education by Radio is sponsoring a general session on Radio and International Understanding. I. Keith Tyler, President, will preside. The speakers will include Lyman Bryson, director of education for the Columbia Broadcasting System, and M. S. Novik, manager of Radio Station WNYC, N.Y.

Of especial interest to high-school teachers of dramatics will be the presentation by AETA of a one-act play and an analysis of performance from the director's point of view by Jasper Deeter, founder director of the Hedgerow Theatre. Mr. Deeter will address the Joint Luncheon on "Visions of the Future."

The NUEA Committee will present a Forum on Compulsory Military Training. The speakers will be the present or past commanders of the American Legion and at least one high-ranking Army officer.

Among the sectional meetings will be a report on research done for the Army and Navy by the famous Voice Communication Laboratory at Waco, Texas, with John W. Black, director of the Laboratory, in charge. This information has now been declassified, and can thus be presented to the ASSOCIATION.

Likewise a section on Speech Rehabilitation of Returning Service Men (Harold Westlake, chairman) will include as speakers Lieutenant Commander Herbert Koepp-Baker, Naval Hospital, Philadelphia, and C. E. Hostetler of the Veterans Hospital in Hines, Illinois.

Finally, a general session on Semantics will present Irving Lee, author of *Language Habits in Human Affairs*, and S. I. Hayakawa, author of *Language in Action*, with M. Kendig, Associate Director of the Institute of General Semantics, serving as a member of the panel.

Members of the ASSOCIATION will be guests of The Ohio State University Theatre at a presentation of *Petticoat Fever*, a comedy by Mark Reed.

—WILLIAM NORWOOD BRIGANCE

NEW BOOKS

HOWARD GILKINSON, *Editor*

Learning to Speak Effectively. Bulletin of the Association for Childhood Education. Second Printing, 1944; Washington, D.C.; pp. 31. $.35.

This booklet was the second 1943 membership service bulletin issued to members by the Association for Childhood Education, publishers of the monthly magazine *Childhood Education.* The bulletins are one of the services offered by the ACE in the interests of better education and welfare of children.

The foreword states that for some time the Association had felt the need for a bulletin on speech education that would be of help to parents and teachers of young children. It meets this need ably within the limitations imposed by pamphlet form.

The information is presented in six manuscripts by speech specialists, followed by brief evaluations of the contents by three educators. The arrangement of papers is a logical one, proceeding from a general discussion of the development of speech through specific suggestions on methods of handling problems.

The first article is "The Importance of Speech" by Charles Van Riper. Many speech teachers, as well as parents and nonspecialists for whom the stimulating little article is designed, could profit from the wholesome point of view presented. The author neatly condenses a number of important facts about the child's speech development, and about undesirable parental attitudes and teaching methods. This paper alone would make the pamphlet helpful to many parents.

The second article, "The Learning and Development of Speech" by Sara Stinchfield-Hawk, carries on with a more detailed analysis of four important periods in the child's speech development: one year to one year and six months, one year and six months to two years, two years to two and one-half, and from two and a half on.

The third contribution, "Types of Speech Disorders" by James F. Bender, attempts an overview of speech disorders for the layman. It fulfills the purpose adequately, although the author has met the usual difficulties of popular simplification.

"Prevention and Correction of Children's Speech Disorders" by John M. Hadley, the fourth article, is probably the hardest subject matter to present. The author discusses two categories of speech problems of children: "Those Characterized by Defective Articulation and Production of Sounds" and "Those Classified as Stuttering or Stammering." He stresses his point of view that in working with defects of articulation the teacher should remember that each sound is a unit, should be learned as such, and cannot be broken up into its component parts. One statement on preventing inception of stuttering is not made clear to the reader: "We know, for instance, that stuttering is always aggravated if not actually caused by someone doing 'too much'." A list of procedures for those working with stuttering children is helpful in the main and avoids most controversial issues. There is need for greater emphasis which additional use of italics might give to such important statements as: "Treat all speech, good or bad, with complete lack of anxiety."

Carrie Rasmussen, who contributed "Activities That Give Practice in Learning to Speak Effectively," has been handicapped by the need to select from a breadth of practical experience some activities and exercises which can be presented briefly enough to conform to the limits of the plan of this booklet and which can be used safely by the nonspecialist. A number of weaknesses of statement probably resulted from condensation. The articulation exercises listed for help with specific sound defects might do more harm than good if used by the nonexpert.

"Lest It Mar Your Teaching," by E. H. Henrikson, describes four characteristics of speech a teacher should have (intelligibility, adaptability, ease, beauty) and gives some recommendations for the teacher's self-help.

Evaluations of the preceding information are made by Louise Abney, Director of Speech Improvement, Kansas City Junior

and Teachers College, Virginia Somes Sanderson, Professor of Education, The Ohio State University, and Letitia Raubicheck, Director, Department of Speech Improvement in the Public Schools of New York City. The purpose which motivated the inclusion of evaluations is obscure.

It is unavoidable that one speech expert will find something with which to disagree in a series of articles by six other experts. Nevertheless the bulletin is generally sound and definitely helpful, although there is some duplication and carelessness in presentation.

Every teacher of speech who deals with parents and every secondary school teacher would find it convenient to have copies of this bulletin on hand for distribution. The ACE is to be commended for issuing it.

MELBA HURD DUNCAN
Brooklyn College

Proceedings of the Writers' Congress, Los Angeles, 1943. Held under the sponsorship of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization and the University of California. Berkeley and Los Angeles, Calif.: University of California Press, 1944; pp. 663. $5.00.

A year ago last October the Los Angeles branch of the University of California was the scene of a gathering of writers convened jointly by the University and a wartime council of screen writing organizations, for the purpose of ascertaining the writers' best channels of contribution towards the war effort. Assemblies of writers are usually held in New York. It was a sign of change that Hollywood, located geographically and, it has been thought, culturally, at the opposite end of the continent, should have been able to mount impressively and carry through with dignity a convocation of this sort. What seemed of special significance, however, was that here writers for the contemned screen had reached the point of viewing themselves as authors, with all the rights and responsibilities attaching to personal expression, and, in a great national crisis, had successfully joined with writers from older, as well as younger, media in the serious consideration of large, extra-trade problems.

Looking over the aggregate of transcribed papers here one is struck anew by the size of the undertaking. Only the motion picture, the radio, and the press were formally embraced, but world-famous novelists, along with distinguished figures from many non-literary fields, including government, widened the range of representation. Some twenty-two separate meetings took the form either of craft seminars, or ideological panels, i.e., discussions dealing with cultural, political, and other subject-matter problems. In the craft category, the feature film, the documentary, the animated cartoon, and the military indoctrination or training film were individually treated. There were sessions devoted to dramatic radio, to radio shortwave, and to radio news and analysis; to humor and the war, music and the war, and song writing and the war. On the noncraft or ideological side, principal topics included The Nature of the Enemy, Problems of the Peace, The American Scene, Propaganda Analysis, and What a Soldier Thinks.

There were too few papers consisting of individual reports on writers' concrete workshop problems. Among papers interested essentially in raising the expressive levels of the film, Sgt. Ben Maddow's on writing for the documentary medium, and Hanns Eisler's on the prejudices blocking the assimilation of new methods in film music were outstanding. Nearly unique in a little discussed field were the four crusading papers calling for new form and subject matter in the animated cartoon.

Least satisfactory was the writers' handling of the problem of the vital but delicate operation of transfering their excellent social attitudes from their minds and consciences to their imaginations and typewriters. "Stories on serious themes" was the way Hollywood had always described a "meaningful" film, and speaker after speaker at the Congress still had this abstraction, "serious themes," put high up on its pedestal, removed from "light entertainment, escapist fluff"; in fact, the whole moving picture business was on a pedestal. "Serious" pictures clearly could never be light entertainment, and needed to be sugar-coated with entertainment as Darryl Zanuck himself said: "I'm speaking of entertainment as a *device* [italics ours] to make the serious, worth-while pictures palatable to mass movie audiences."

Dudley Nichols, the distinguished screenwriter, recently summed up the trouble with Hollywood's present approach to the screen story as "the tendency to regard a story as an invention, as something cleverly contrived." (In an essay, "The Writer and the Film," *Twenty Best Film Plays,* ed. John Gassner and Dudley Nichols (1944), p. ix.) Now this quality of contrivance is a part

of what the businessmen in the film industry call "showmanship." There is nothing really wrong with it, but rather, in a theatrical medium like the movies, quite the opposite. The fault is in the unwriter-like habit of starting with the "trick" situation, the topical "angle," the "social significance," and never getting beyond these to the human situation, to the real characters, to the universal significance. The order is wrong, and that is one reason why there is so little original expression in Hollywood—even on subjects which the producers allow to be treated. When Hollywood's writers will have reached the point where they can take their showmanship in their stride, they will be in a position to function genuinely as writers. They will begin then with the human idea they have decided to elucidate on the screen, with the aspect of personality they have never seen treated there quite as they wish to treat it, and they will go ahead, relying upon their developed skill in the medium to give their work the requisite "entertainment value," their vocation as writers—rather than window-dressers or advertising account-executives—to provide the interpretative depth, the formal fineness, the emotional sensitivity which are the artist's pleasure.

HAROLD LEONARD,
Editor, The Film Index

Psychology in Living. By WENDELL WHITE. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944; pp. 333. $2.50.

Teachers of public speaking are interested in the whole individual. Unlike teachers in other fields, they are interested in the student in all his relationships. The teacher of mathematics may notice that a student is maladjusted, but do nothing about it; the teacher of speech wonders why the student is out of step with his environment and through conferences seeks to help the student to overcome his difficulties. Anyone who can help the teacher of public speaking do a better job of assisting his charges is a friend. Wendell White has just issued his *Psychology in Living*, a most helpful book. Most teachers of speech are familiar with his *Psychology of Dealing with People* and his *Psychology of Making Life Interesting*. The substance of these two books is in this new one, but I believe on the whole it is presented in a much more interesting fashion for students of public speaking. Perhaps this is partly due to the fact that a colleague, Haldor B. Gislason of the University of Minnesota, studied the entire manuscript and made many helpful criticisms in regard to both subject matter and method of presentation. The entire book is fascinating, for it not only reveals the teacher to himself, but also the students to the teacher. Such chapters as "Indirect Presentation of Ideas," "Direct Presentation of Ideas," "Inoffensive Opposition to Ideas," and "Interesting Expression" are of special interest to our group.

I like the straightforward stating of right and wrong. Professor White has a standard of value for himself and for society and he is not afraid to call exploitation exploitation. He is not so much in love with psychology that he does not see how it can be misused. It is refreshing to read a book on science and find the author brave enough to show where the science he is dealing with is in danger of undermining society.

The temptation to quote page after page of Mr. White's book is great but there would be no end to citation. It is sufficient to say that this book is going to be of inestimable assistance to me in my teaching. I shall surely recommended it to all my students.

I like the at-homeness of the author with English literature. Here is our friend Minniver Cheevy, here is a familiar couplet from Pope, here is a reference to Charles Dickens, Burns' poem "John Anderson" is quoted. These references enliven the style and make the book more interesting.

The entire book is based on the thesis that each individual is striving for personal worth. How the individual strives in vain and how he how he strives successfully is thoroughly explored. Public speaking is one of the ways in which a student strives for personal worth and this book has much of value for the student and teacher of public speaking.

LIONEL CROCKER,
Denison University

BOOKS AND MATERIALS RECEIVED

International Airways. The Reference Shelf, Vol. 18, No. 2. Compiled by ALBERTA WORTHINGTON. New York: H. W. Wilson Company, 1945; pp. 275. $1.25.

Peacetime Conscription. The Reference Shelf Vol. 18, No. 4. Compiled by JULIA E. JOHNSON. New York: H. W. Wilson Company, 1945; pp. 327. $1.25.

IN THE PERIODICALS

MARIE HOCHMUTH, *Editor*

RHETORIC, PUBLIC ADDRESS, AND RADIO

BENDER, JAMES F., "Is It Time to Do Some Brushing Up On Salesmen's Speech Habits?" *Sales Management,* LIV (July 1, 1945), 128ff.

"Grammar and pronunciation are part of a salesman's manners. If his speech is tarnished with errors, he may lose prestige in the eyes of his prospect." Mr. Bender, Director of The National Institute for Human Relations, outlines a technique of testing for speech imperfections and lists 10 of the most common errors.

BLACK, MAX, "A New Method of Presentation of the Theory of the Syllogism," *Journal of Philosophy,* XLII (August 16, 1945), 449-455.

"It is customary today to regard the theory of the syllogism, by contrast with the more powerful generalized systems of symbolic logic, as an unfortunate survival of older and more muddled ways of thought." The writer believes, however, that so long as the syllogism continues to be used constantly in everyday reasoning and to figure prominently in elementary logic courses, it ought to be discussed in the most lucid and accurate manner possible. A new method of presentation is explained.

CAMPBELL, CLYDE M., "The Role of the Chairman in Group Discussions," *Adult Education Bulletin,* IX (June, 1945), 135-140.

"Under the right kind of leadership, participants may be amazed at the unique contribution of their group; especially is this true if the members are seriously trying to solve problems that are of mutual concern." Campbell discusses the more important traits of the chairman of discussion groups and the procedures which he should follow in conducting a discussion.

HARRINGTON, ELBERT W., "Albert Baird Cummins as a Public Speaker," *Iowa Journal of History and Politics,* XLIII (July ,1945), 209-253.

"Albert B. Cummins deserves a place in the list of American orators, although he was not one of the country's greatest public speakers." Using a pattern of analysis based upon the classical divisions of rhetoric, Harrington discusses the source of Cummins' power as a speaker and his methods.

SINGER, HARRY, "Fourteen Keys to the Building of Better Sales Presentations," *Sales Management,* LV (August 15, 1945), 109-114.

While there is no formula for putting together a sales producing presentation, there is, however, "a technique which should always be the psychological basis for getting a sales story into the customer's consciousness in a manner which will cause him to act." Fourteen keys to the "delicate, complicated, highly-specialized art" of sales presentations are discussed.

STACE, W. T., "The Problem of Unreasoned Belief," *Mind: A Quarterly Review of Psychology and Philosophy,* LIV (April, 1945), 122-147.

Except perhaps in the case of beliefs produced by pure "random conditioning," the so-called unreasoned beliefs only appear to be unreasoned, and the psychological processes only appear to be nonlogical. "Most of them are in their essence reasoning processes, though the reasoning may be more or less crude." The writer examines the nature of various thought-processes.

STEWART, MILTON, "Radio Commentators and Free Speech," *Common Sense,* XIV (August, 1945), 32-34.

Among other things, Stewart pleads for a "substitution of constructive, fruitful town-meeting discussions for the one-sided voices

of gloom, doom and hysteria who call themselves radio commentators."

THOMPSON, WAYNE N., "A Broader Philosophy for Debaters . . . ," *Gavel,* XXVII (May, 1945), 52ff.

Thompson considers the question, "What is the student doing when he debates?" "Although some speakers may have their own selfish purposes, the goal of debate in a larger sense is deciding whether a suggested solution to a problem should be accepted or rejected." Advocacy and persuasion are "methods" not "ends."

UMBACH, HERBERT H., "The Merit of Metaphysical Style in Donne's Easter Sermons," *ELH: A Journal of English Literary History,* XII (June, 1945), 108-129.

Eleven Easter Sermons of John Donne furnish the basis for a study of the characteristics of style and thought of the seventeenth-century metaphysical sermon.

WECTER, DIXON, "Hearing Is Believing," *Atlantic Monthly,* CLXXVI (July, 1945), 37-43.

Wecter explores the influence of the radio reporter and the news analyst in the second of a series of three articles. Individual records of the commentators, their reliability, their prejudices, and their mistakes are scrutinized.

WECTER, DIIXON, "Hearing Is Believing," *Atlantic Monthly,* CLXXVI (August, 1945), 54-61.

In the third of a series of three articles, Wecter explores the influence of the radio reporter and the news analyst. Fulton Lewis, Jr. and Upton Close are given special consideration. In general, Wecter concludes that "the tradition of debating national issues—once a great American custom, now seldom heard by the mass of our people—calls for revival, in terms of familiar radio personalities. . . . The meeting of minds, and their collision, is an old but not outmoded method for advancing truth."

WILCOX, STANLEY, "Isocrates' Fellow-Rhetoricians," *American Journal of Philology,* LXVI (April, 1945), 171-186.

In an examination of Isocrates' allusions to other rhetoricians, Wilcox concludes that Isocrates "does not accuse his fellow-rhetoricians of writing for litigants or of teaching legal chicanery. Rather, they are said to belong to the same profession and to write epideictic speeches like his own." As a champion of the elaborate style, Isocrates seems to have "wilfully confused the simple style of his rivals with the forensic style of the logographers."

DRAMA AND INTERPRETATION

COOKE, ANNE M., "The Little Theatre Movement as an Adult Education Project Among Negroes," *The Journal of Negro Education,* XIV (Summer, 1945), 418-424.

In many Southern communities the college affords the only opportunity for cultural experiences. The writer surveys college dramatics in Negro colleges and little theatre in various communities, concluding that "those activities with long-term programs which grow out of permanent institutions tend to live longest and achieve the soundest success."

DRAPER, JOHN W., "The Tempo of Shylock's Speech," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology,* XLIV (July, 1945), 281-285.

In an analysis of Shakespeare's indications pertaining to the speed at which he intended Shylock's lines to be delivered, Draper concludes that Shylock's tempo was to be "astonishingly slow." The writer offers several explanations. "Could Shakespeare have calculated the jerky tempo of Shylock's part to the speech-habits of the actor who he knew would take the part?"

GRANVILLE-BAKER, HARLEY, "A Theatre That Might Be," *Theatre Arts,* XXIX (June, 1945), 370-377.

Surveying its past, and envisaging its future, the writer discusses the use of the drama. The prestige of the art of the theatre ultimately rests upon guardianship of the "drama of enduring worth."

PARDOE, T. EARL, "Drama in Wartime London," *Players Magazine,* XXI (March, 1945), 6.

"Thirty-seven of the great capital's major theatres operate as if no war were in progress." The writer discusses the plays current in wartime London.

SELDEN, SAMUEL, "Compulsive Speech on the Stage," *Players Magazine,* XXI (April, 1945), 8.

"Speech which is compulsive—speech which stirs the listener in all his parts, which catches him and holds him in its spell—is speech which is impregnated with the same kind of sound-magic as that which motivates singing." The writer discusses the elements of "compulsive speech."

SELDEN, SAMUEL, "Characterization in Pantomime, *Players Magazine,* XXI (May, 1945), 36ff.

"Characterized posture and movement do not spring from some different, far-off pattern of living; they are simply normal ways of doing things changed by force of circumstances." Selden discusses the problems of characterized movement.

SPRINGER, ANGUS, "Lighting the Stage Setting," *Players Magazine,* XXI (April, 1945), 7ff.

The writer discusses the five principal functions of stage lighting, and discusses the means of accomplishing them in the modern theatre.

SPRINGER, ANGUS, "Stage Lighting Equipment," *Players Magazine,* XXI (May, 1945), 9ff.

In the second of a series of articles on the general subject of stage lighting, the writer discusses some considerations in regard to the various types of stage lighting equipment in common use. Footlights, border lights, striplights, floodlights, spotlights, and switchboards are discussed.

STIRLING, BRENTS, "Shakespeare's Mob Scenes: A Reinterpretation," *The Huntington Library Quarterly,* VIII (May, 1945), 213-240.

The study attempts to discover from certain popular literature, from official propaganda, and from published sermons the probable responses of an Elizabethan audience to Shakespeare's Cade scenes or to the Roman plebeians as they appeared on the London stage. The study ultimately will include techniques and traditions of stagecraft as well as social background.

VIERTEL, BERTHOLD, "Bertolt Brecht, Dramatist," *Kenyon Review,* VII (Summer, 1945), 467-475.

"The idea of Epic Theatre has never been systematically expanded." The writer discusses the theory of Epic Theatre and presents an exposition of Brecht's one-act plays in relation to it.

ZINK, SIDNEY, "The Poetic Organism," *Journal of Philosophy,* XLII (August 2, 1945), 421-433.

A poem contains "neither a prosaic 'structure' or 'tenor,' nor the complementary and distinctively poetic 'texture' or 'vehicle.' The poem is rather an organization of meaning qualities." The writer discusses the principle of artistic unity.

LANGUAGE AND PHONETICS

ANDERSON, J. REDWOOD, "The King's English," *English,* V (Spring, 1945), 108-110.

"Languages have died—but this is surely the first time in the history of the human race that men have deliberately conspired to *assassinate* their mother-tongue." The writer discusses Basic English, fearing that traditional English will become "a provincial and eroded dialect," if encouragement is given to Basic English.

BARKER, GEORGE C., "The Social Functions of Language," *A Review of General Semantics,* II (Summer, 1945), 228-234.

"While the coordination of group activity now is widely accepted as a basic social function of language, little attempt has been made to establish a systematic classification covering the whole field of such social functions." Barker distinguishes the psychological from the sociological function of language, discusses the evolution of interest in the social functions of language, and attempts to describe and classify the social functions of language.

FREY, J. WILLIAM, "Amish 'Triple Talk,'" *American Speech,* XX (April, 1945), 85-98.

Frey examines some of the general and distinguishing features of the type of Pennsylvania Dutch and High German that the Amish speak. The occasions on which the Amish use their dialect or their High German are also discussed.

GILBERT, KATHARINE, "The Intent and Tone of Mr. I. A. Richards," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism,* III (No. 11-12, 1945), 29-48.

The final scope of the practical intent of Mr. I. A. Richards' labors with words "has been nothing less than the complete breadth of human relationships." The writer presents a comprehensive interpretation of the labors of Mr. Richards.

HOGAN, CHARLES H., "A Yankee Comments on Texas Speech," *American Speech,* XX (April, 1945), 81-84.

Texas has developed a way of speech "peculiarly its own." The writer discusses various Texan linguistic usages.

NEUMANN, J. H., "American Newspaper Interest in English Language Problems," *American Speech,* XX (April, 1945), 99-105.

In a study of the *New York Times, New York Herald-Tribune,* and *World-Telegram,* the writer concludes that the *New York Times* has consistently and over a period of years shown a "greater concern" than other American newspapers in problems affecting the English language.

WHITNEY, LEON K., "Reducing Resistances to General Semantics," *A Review of General Semantics,* II (Summer, 1945), 236-239.

The writer discusses four bases for resistance of the subject of semantics, urging that we "write about general semantics *to someone,* because it is a kind of knowledge that will be wasted if people in general do not get it into their nervous systems." Much of what has been spoken or written on the subject "falls short of its communicative destination."

SPEECH SCIENCE

BIRREN, JAMES E., "Static Equilibrium and Vestibular Function," *Journal of Experimental Psychology,* XXXV (April, 1945), 127-133.

The writer investigates the extent to which man depends on vestibular functions to maintain normal posture, concluding that his findings are "interpreted as indicating that man may maintain stable posture despite loss of vestibular function, and that measurements of body sway cannot be used to detect vestibular defects."

BROCKWAY, WILLIAM W., and DON C. BROCKWAY, "Air Terminal Sound System," *Electronics,* XVIII (June, 1945), 138-141.

The writers describe how an up-to-date sound system was engineered to solve the problems peculiar to the busy Lockheed Air Terminal at Burbank.

CHAPUT, GIRARD, "Phone Me By Air," *Saturday Evening Post,* CCXVIII (July 28, 1945), 16 ff.

"Handie-talkies may result in a civilian world seething with airborne language." The writer discusses the transmission and reception of short-range messages over certain wave lengths recently made possible by the action of the Federal Communications Commission.

COOKE, L. B., "The Voice of Ship Command," *Bell Laboratories Record,* XXIII (July, 1945), 241-245.

Bell Laboratories' basic studies of hearing and intelligibility of speech provided the background for the study of the specialized conditions on board ship. The writer discusses development, design, and uses of "Battle Announcing Systems."

HUBBELL, RICHARD T., "Use of Sound in Television," *Televiser,* I (Summer, 1945), 27 ff.

The writer discusses sound effects in television and presents the problem of synchronizing speech and visual action.

KNOWER, FRANKLIN H., "Studies in the Symbolism of Voice and Action: V. The Use of Behavioral and Tonal Symbols as Tests of Speaking Achievement," *The Journal of Applied Psychology,* XXIX (June, 1945), 229-235.

The writer reports results of an investigation designed to secure data which might throw light on the answers to the following questions: (1) It is possible to develop reliable and valid objective group tests of a speaker's skill in the use of tonal and behavioral symbolism as such? and (2) What can we learn from such objective tests about the relationship of such skills to the total

effectiveness of the speaker in speaking, and to other characteristics of the speaker as a person?

LOEWI, OTTO, "Chemical Transmission of Nerve Impulses," *American Scientist,* XXXIII (July, 1945), 159-174.

"The discovery of the neurochemical mechanism has finally provided a conclusive answer to the important, long-standing problem concerning the nature of the transmission of excitation from the nerve to its effector organ. The proof that this transmission is effected by substances liberated by the nervous system also furnishes the first evidence that the nervous system exerts specific chemical reactions." The writer presents a comprehensive discussion of the transmission of nerve impulses.

MILLS, JOHN, "Electrical Communication," *Scientific Monthly,* LXI (August, 1945), 138-142.

In electrical communication, "The historic divisions, like telephony or radio now overlap and are no longer sharply distinguished. In any communication system, however, will be found four, or more, of the six basic operations of generation, modulation, amplification, transmission, selection and demodulation."

PIERCE, J. R., "Reflex Oscillators," *Bell Laboratories Record,* XXIII (August, 1945), 287-290.

Several types of long-transit-time tubes called reflex oscillators have been made available for military use. The writer describes the new device and discusses electrical and mechanical advantages.

PINNER, MAX, GEORGE C. LEINER, and WILLIAM A. ZAVOD, "Bronchospirometry." *Annals of Internal Medicine,* XXII (May, 1945), 704-718.

The writers discuss the relatively recent method of bronchospirometry by which the functions and volumina of each lung are determined separately at the same time. Results of bronchospirometric studies which were pursued at Montefiore Hospital during the last five and a half years are presented.

TRAUFFER, ARTHUR, "FM 'Wireless' Record Player Uses Capacity Phono-Pickup." *Popular Mechanics Magazine,* LXXXIV (August, 1945), 142 ff.

The writer presents diagrams and a discussion of a simple one-tube frequency-modulated phono-oscillator which will reproduce records through an FM receiver without wired connections.

THE TEACHING OF SPEECH

BLACK, ELIZABETH, "Informal Dramatics as a Socializing Force," *Instructor,* LIV (September, 1945), 38.

Dramatics offers as many possibilities for good teamwork as does any other highly organized game. A teacher discusses standards of achievement for performances which may be worked out cooperatively.

FISHER, MARY CECELIA, "Clubs Are Trumps in Guidance," *Nation's Schools,* XXXVI (August, 1945), 42-43.

"A young person in a club which challenges his interest reveals facets of personality and character that his classroom teacher rarely glimpses." After twenty-two years of experience working with young people, the writer discusses the importance of clubs for social, moral, and vocational guidance.

FLYNN, HELEN and STEPHEN M. COREY, "Teaching Communication Through the Use of Sound Films," *The School Review,* LIII (June, 1945), 348-352.

The writers describe procedures for motivating and teaching communication skills by means of the sound film, "The Middle States." Four types of learning experience are illustrated: (1) writing activities—learning to express ideas; (2) oral activities—planned and extemporaneous speaking; (3) organizing activities—learning to outline; and (4) research activities—learning to use library facilities and to prepare a report.

HOVIOUS, CAROL, "What Words Mean!" *Education Digest,* X (May, 1945), 20-22.

Lack of interest in school subjects is often due to a failure to understand the technical words of the subject. "No dictionary can do for words what the teacher can do. Even if our students were willing dictionary dig-

gers—which they aren't—they would need the teacher to give life, substance, reality to the cold verbal corpses in a dictionary."

McMillin, Martha, "Oral and Written Skills," *Grade Teacher,* LXIII (September, 1945), 64 ff.

"In the seventh grade, pupils should become accustomed to speaking informally before the class. The writer outlines objectives and methods of procedure relating to oral skills. Outlines are also presented for improvement in written skills.

Newhart, Horace, and Scott N. Reger, "Syllabus of Audiometric procedures in the Administration of a Program for the Conservation of Hearing of School Children," *Supplement to the Transactions of the American Academy of Ophthalmology and Otolaryngology* (April, 1945), 7-28.

The syllabus has been planned as a guide on various technical aspects of projects devoted to the conservation of hearing of school children and is intended for use by supervisors of state and local programs, audiometer technicians, school personnel and other individuals and cooperating agencies.

Ress, Etta Schneider, "Group Discussion Through Motion Pictures," *Educational Screen,* XXIV (June, 1945), 230-233.

"The film forum series held at the Walt Whitman Library has revealed what other film forums throughout the nation have undoubtedly experienced, viz. that we have hit upon a very good means of adult education but that we must greatly refine our methods. In the second of a series of articles presenting results of research relating to the success of film forums, the writer concludes that a "lack of suitable films to provoke discussion is an obstacle to the film forum movement."

Richter, George, "Your School Clubs," *Grade Teacher,* LXIII (September, 1945), 52.

The article describes the steps taken by five public school teachers who set up a club program in an elementary school, in order to capitalize spontaneous and deep-seated pupil interest.

PSYCHOLOGY AND PATHOLOGY OF SPEECH

Altmann, Franz, and Jules G. Waltner, "Slight Operative Injuries of the Stapes," *Archives of Otolaryngology,* XLII (July, 1945), 42-46.

"The most frequent operative injuries of the labyrinth are luxation or extraction of the stapes and opening of the lateral semicircular canal." The writers present a case, demonstrating "the dangers arising from careless curetting in the neighborhood of the oval window and too tight packing of the operative cavity."

Arieti, Silvano, "Primitive Habits and Perceptual Alterations in the Terminal Stage of Schizophrenia," *Archives of Neurology and Psychiatry,* LIII (May, 1945), 378-384.

The writer presents reports of a study carried out on 250 female patients with the chronic form of schizophrenia who had been hospitalized in institutions for mental disease from seven to forty-seven years.

Erich, John B., "Treatment of Extensive Cicatricial Stenosis of the Larynx or the Trachea," *Archives of Otolaryngology,* XLI (May, 1945), 343-350.

"Extensive cicatricial stenosis of the larynx or the upper part of the trachea usually can be treated most successfully by an open operation through an incision in the neck." The writer discusses three stages in therapy.

Fowler, Major Edmund P., "Causes of Deafness in Flyers," *Archives of Otolaryngology,* XLII (July, 1945), 21-32.

A member of the United States Army Medical Corps discusses pathologic and clinical observations in cases of loss of hearing from airplane flight.

Halstead, Ward C., "A Power Factor (P) in General Intelligence: the Effect of Brain Injuries," *The Journal of Psychology,* XX (July, 1945), 57-63.

The writer presents results of an exploratory factor analysis study made of test data secured from 50 neuro-psychiatric patients, concluding that "it seems probable that for the first time it has been possible to isolate a factor in general intelligence which has

biological validity. This factor is tentatively named a power (P) factor."

HANSSON, K. G., "Body Mechanics and Posture," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, CXXVIII (July 28, 1945), 947-953.

"Every one should have some knowledge of body mechanics, because it has its application in all specialties." The writer discusses the relationship of posture to health, the evolution of posture, posture standards and treatment, and body mechanics in various specialties (orthopedics, pediatrics, obstetrics and gynecology, and internal medicine).

HEBB, D. O., "Man's Frontal Lobes," *Archives of Neurology and Psychiatry*, LIV (July, 1945), 10-24.

The writer reviews and evaluates the published reports which attempt to analyze the functions of the frontal lobes on the basis of neurosurgical material. Hebb emphasizes his "failure to find psychologic defects that can be attributed to clean surgical injury of the frontal lobes."

HOLINGER, PAUL H., "Carcinoma of the Larynx," *Illinois Medical Journal*, LXXXVIII (July, 1945), 19-23.

"Cancer of the larynx is one of the most curable of all cancers." Dr. Holinger discusses diagnosis and therapy.

HUTTON, E. L., "What Is Meant by Personality?" *Journal of Mental Science*, XCI (April, 1945), 153-165.

"Strictly speaking, personality is an ethical and spiritual category, and the psychologist who would study it must do so from the ethical and religious standpoint, and not from the psychological." The author undertakes the problem of definition of related terms including, "individual," "character," "I or ego," "self," finally arriving at his concept of personality.

JACKSON, CHEVALIER L., and CHARLES M. NORRIS, "Surgical Treatment of Cancer of the Larynx," *The Laryngoscope*, LV (May, 1945), 196-215.

"The treatment of cancer of the intrinsic larynx is by *surgery* or by some form of *irradiation*, or by a combination of these methods." The writer discusses surgical methods and techniques, and results.

LAWRENCE, EDWIN A., and PHILIP S. BREZINA, "Carcinoma of the Oral Cavity," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, CXXVIII (August 4, 1945), 1012-1016.

Carcinoma of the oral and pharyngeal mucous membranes comprises three per cent of all cancer and accounts for approximately 3,700 deaths yearly in the United States registration area. The writer discusses 145 cases of carcinoma of the oral cavity observed at the New Haven Hospital during a period of ten years.

LENTZ, THEO. F., "Opinion Change in Time of War," *Journal of Psychology*, XX (July, 1945), 147-156.

The Attitude Research Laboratory secured the reactions of 100 young adults to some 1500 items pertaining to peace, internationalism, and race relations during a six year period. The study reveals that "Opinions change but, like the positions of the members of the starry universe, they are (a) orderly and gradual in their change and comprehensible to human intelligence; i.e., understandable, and (b) promise rich rewards to systematic and extended observation."

MORGAN, JOHN J. B., "Value of Wrong Responses in Inductive Reasoning," *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, XXXV (April, 1945), 141-146.

"Failures in science are more illuminating than are successes." The writer presents the results of an experiment designed to test the hypothesis that failures to solve a problem foster inductive reasoning more than do immediate and uniform successes.

PEACHER, CAPT. WILLIAM G., "Speech Disorders in World War II," *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, CII (August, 1945), 165-171.

Two hundred seventeen cases have been observed in a survey of speech disorders conducted at Brooke General Hospital, beginning May, 1943, and ending January, 1945. The writer classifies the disorders and discusses therapy.

POOS, EDGAR E., "The War Deafened and Their Rehabilitation," *The Eye, Ear, Nose & Throat Monthly,* XXIV (July, 1945), 329-331.

The writer briefly reviews some of the ways in which men have developed their deafness as a result of war and discusses means of readjustment.

ROWNTREE, COL. LEONARD G., KENNETH H. MCGILL, and LOUIS P. HELLMAN, "Mental and Personality Disorders in Selective Service Registrants," *Journal of the American Medical Association,* CXXVIII (August 11, 1945), 1084-1087.

Mental and personality disorders were the principal cause for rejection of 801,700, or approximately 17.8 per cent, of registrants aged 18-37 in rejected classes on January 1, 1945. The writers present results of diagnoses of registrants, concluding among other things: "Psychoneurotic disorders were the most frequent type of disorder recorded for both races—the bases for more than half of these diagnoses were functional disorders of expressive movements (tics, stammering, stuttering) and neurocirculatory asthenia."

SCOOGINS, MAXINE, "Auditory Tests Should be Given Every School Child," *Texas Outlook,* XXIX (August, 1945), 14-15.

A hearing defect which greatly affects the child's personality may not be detected by the average teacher. The writer believes it imperative that an auditory examination be given every child upon his entrance to public school, and that examinations be repeated every two or three years.

SELBY, C. D., "The Attitude of Industry Toward X-Ray Examinations of the Chest." *Journal of the American Medical Association,* CXXVIII (June 30, 1945), 630-632.

"Collectively, industry has no defined attitude on the use of x-rays as an aid in diagnosing diseases of the thoracic organs in employees and applicants for employment." The writer reports results of an investigation designed to determine the attitude of industry toward x-ray examinations, and discusses attempts at promoting such examination on the part of committees of the National Association of Manufacturers and of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

SENTURIA, CAPT. BEN H., "Etiology of External Otitis," *Laryngoscope,* LV (June, 1945), 277-293.

The first of a series of reports of an investigation of the etiology, pathology and treatment of external otitis. The report deals only with available literature and data obtained in regard to the etiology of external otitis.

WERNER, HEINZ (With the collaboration of Doris Carrison), "Perceptual Behavior of Brain-Injured, Mentally Defective Children: an Experimental Study by Means of the Rorschach Technique," *Genetic Psychology Monographs,* XXXI (May, 1945), 53-110.

The writers present results of a study designed to analyze the perceptual and conceptual behavior of brain-injured and non-brain injured subnormal children of comparable mental ages by means of the Rorschach technique.

NEWS AND NOTES

OTA THOMAS, *Editor*

Please send items of interest for this department to OTA THOMAS, HUNTER COLLEGE, NEW YORK CITY

AN ASSOCIATION ACHIEVEMENT

Speech in the Secondary School is the title of the November, 1945, number of the Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals. This work, of about 200 pages, prepared under the supervision of a special committee of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH and with the cooperation of the American Educational Theatre Association, the American Speech Correction Association, and the Association for Education by Radio, is a land mark in the history of our ASSOCIATION.

Never before has the role of Speech in the secondary schools been explained so completely; all phases of Speech are treated by more than forty contributors. The Bulletin will go to approximately 10,000 principals.

The general committee supervising the project is as follows: *Franklin H. Knower* (Chairman), *Willadell Allen, Gladys Borchers,* Herschel L. Bricker (President, AETA), *W. Norwood Brigance, Kenneth G. Hance,* Harry J. Heltman (President, ASCA), Evelyn Konigsberg, Cyretta Morford, Katherine A. Ommanney, *Karl F. Robinson,* Joseph F. Smith, Ruth H. Thomas, I. Keith Tyler (President, AER), Karl R. Wallace, Andrew T. Weaver and *W. Hayes Yeager.* Those whose names are in italics have acted as the Executive Committee.

Anticipating that there will be a considerable demand for copies from the members of our ASSOCIATION, Loren Reid, Executive Secretary, has placed an advance order for 500 copies. To be certain of obtaining one, place your order with him now. The price is $1.00.

NEW APPOINTMENTS

George R. Kernodle, formerly at Western Reserve University, has joined the speech staff at the University of Iowa. Mr. Kernodle will teach history of the theatre and direct historical plays.

• • •

Richard B. Lewis has resigned from his position at Walla Walla College and has assumed new teaching duties in the Department of English and Speech at Pacific Union College.

• • •

Klonda Lynn, who for the past eighteen years has been in charge of speech work at Arizona State College, has been appointed to a position in the University of Arizona and began teaching there in September. In addition to her work with the fundamentals courses, she is assisting in the speech clinic. She replaces E. Mary Huyck who resigned last May to enter a convent.

• • •

William G. McCollom has left the University of Maryland and joined the speech department at Western Reserve University.

• • •

Yetta Mitchell is now on the faculty of the New Jersey State Teachers College in Montclair.

• • •

Charlotte Wells, formerly of Mt. Holyoke College, joined the staff of the Department of Speech and Drama at Stanford University this fall. She is offering courses in fundamentals, interpretation, and speech correction.

• • •

Hale Aarnes has resigned as Chairman of the Department of Speech, Radio, and Dramatic Art at the University of South Dakota and is now chairman of the Radio Department at Stephens College.

• • •

The University of Illinois has added twelve new members to its speech department. They are, together with the schools where they were formerly teaching: Richard Murphy, University of Colorado; Lee S. Hultzen, University of Missouri; Cullen B. Owens, Cornell University; Kenneth Burns, University of North Dakota; Ruby Wispe, De Paul University; Otis Walter and Ward Ankrum, University of Denver; Lila Wenig, Northwestern University; Marie Shere, St. John's

Crippled School and Hospital, Riverton, Illinois; Lois Kerchenfaut; John G. Felton, Jr., Morningside College; Lucilla Hall, Northwestern University.

• • •

John H. McDowell is the new Director of Drama at Ohio State University. He left Smith College to assume his new duties.

• • •

Cameron W. Garbutt joined the speech clinic staff at Cornell University in September. For the past two years he has held a fellowship at Louisiana State University.

• • •

Richard V. Corson, formerly an instructor of drama and technical director of the theatre at the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, is now technical director of the Experimental Theatre of Vassar College at Poughkeepsie, New York.

• • •

Eleanor Gasparovich is now an instructor of radio on the speech staff of St. Louis University.

• • •

Geraldine Fergen is directing speech correction in the public schools of Bloomington, Illinois.

• • •

Betty Shepherd is engaged in rehabilitation work with war-deafened veterans at Borden General Hospital, Chickasha, Oklahoma.

• • •

Carl B. Cass is now a member of the Drama Department at the University of Oklahoma.

• • •

Herbert L. Curry was appointed this fall to the speech faculty at the University of Tulsa.

PERSONALS

P. E. Lull returned to the faculty of Purdue University in October after two and one-half years on the staff of the Army Air Force Flexible Gunnery School at Laredo, Texas. Lt. H. Kenn Carmichael, who has also been on leave of absence from Purdue, is now stationed at the United States Naval Photographic Services Depot, Hollywood, California. He is assisting in the preparation of training films for the Educational Services Section of the Navy.

• • •

Hubert Heffner, Executive Head of the Department of Speech and Drama at Stanford University, has taken a year's leave of absence to organize and direct the drama program for the Army university at Biarritz, France. During his absence, Virgil A. Anderson is serving as executive head.

Lawrence Carra of the University of Texas and William Lucas of Northwestern University were visiting members of the speech staff at Stanford University this past summer.

• • •

Wilbur E. Moore of the Central Michigan College of Education was on the summer session faculty of the College of the Pacific, teaching courses in speech correction.

• • •

Norman William Freestone, Director of Speech Correction in Occidental College, is now Editor of *Western Speech*.

• • •

In addition to the series of eight lectures and readings given at both Louisiana State University and the University of Missouri last June, Joseph F. Smith also presented a reading of short stories at Wabash College. Later in the summer he joined the staff of the Banff School of Fine Arts in Alberta, Canada.

• • •

W. Norwood Brigance, First Vice-President of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH, during the months of July and August visited the speech faculties of the College of the Pacific, Stanford University, University of California, Pacific Union College, University of Southern California, University of California at Los Angeles, Occidental College, and Redlands University.

• • •

Lee Norvelle, who was Commandant last year of the Navy V-12 unit in the College of the Pacific, has been discharged as a Lieutenant, USNR, and has resumed his duties as Head of the Department of Speech in Indiana University.

• • •

Robertson Strawn of the speech department at Nebraska State Teachers College, Kearney, is now on leave of absence and is serving as a Lieutenant in the Navy. He is stationed at Guam where he was recently appointed Director of Education. In addition to his duties, Lt. Strawn has been conducting a class in speech for which college credit is offered by Nebraska State Teachers College. Harold L. Ahrendts has been Acting Chair-

man of the department since Mr. Strawn entered the Navy.

• • •

For the third successive summer, W. Arthur Cable, Head of the Department of Speech in the University of Arizona, taught advanced phonetics at the University of Denver.

• • •

Lionel Crocker was on the faculty of the University of Michigan for the summer session. He taught courses in debate and discussion.

• • •

C. D. England has now recovered from a serious operation and is back at work in the Dartmouth Speech Clinic.

• • •

Albert Crews, NBC production director in Chicago, has been granted a seven-month leave of absence to assist in establishing a radio department at the new United States Armed Force Institute at Biarritz, France. Major Crews was formerly in charge of the School of Speech radio department at Northwestern University.

• • •

Major Otto A. Dieter is expected to return shortly from his war service and resume his teaching at the University of Illinois.

• • •

Eugene H. Bahn, William M. Timmons, and Elbert R. Moses are all on leave from the Ohio State University. Mr. Bahn is in England with the Red Cross. Mr. Timmons, who has been stationed in Washington, D.C., expects to be released from the Navy shortly. Mr. Moses is in Italy at the Allied Force Headquarters located at Caserta.

• • •

William H. Ewing, formerly of the speech department at the Ohio State University, is now program director of the University Radio Station WOSU.

• • •

Wayne C. Eubank of Louisiana State University was sent to Europe in March. Since then he has been *aide de camp* to the Commanding General of the Ground Forces Reenforcement Command.

• • •

Lt. (jg) H. H. Perritt, formerly supervisor of speech education in the College of Education at Louisiana State University, visited the campus in September after a fifteen-month tour of duty as officer-in-charge of a naval radio station in Brazil. He goes to Pearl Harbor for assignment to duty with the Pacific Fleet Radio Unit.

PROFESSIONAL

This past summer Stanford University offered its third annual Radio Institute in cooperation with NBC and Station KPO, San Francisco. Professional training in radio was given by selected members of the NBC-KPO staffs, as well as by Harlen Adams, William Lucas, Lawrence Carra, and Inez G. Richardson of the Stanford faculty. The Institute had a total registration of eighty-five students.

• • •

Northwestern University is this year undertaking two new projects in its radio program. As a feature of The Reviewing Stand, a weekly radio forum given by the university over the Mutual Network, three programs were originated in California during September—one from San Francisco and two from Los Angeles. James H. McBurney, Dean of the School of Speech, served as moderator for these discussions on "Should Industry Move West?," "Our Stake in the Pacific," and "The Propaganda Role of Motion Pictures" which included distinguished panels of Pacific Coast experts. He was accompanied on the tour by Donley Feddersen, Director of Radio at Northwestern, who was in charge of program arrangements. A second project is the inauguration of a new one-year course designed to train students in the techniques of writing daytime radio serials. The course will be taught by Irna Phillips, writer of three current radio serials (The Guiding Light, Today's Children, and The Woman in White).

• • •

Ninety-eight high-school juniors attended the fifteenth annual High School Institute at Northwestern this summer. The Institute is a five-week course offered in three sections: dramatics, public speaking and debate, and radio.

COLLEGE THEATRE

Baylor University last August presented *The Trojan Women* by Euripides to a total audience of 1500 in four night performances. Original music for the production was written by Daniel Sternberg, Chairman of the Baylor School of Music. The play was under the direction of L. Louise Hash and was presented in the Baylor Outdoor Theater.

This past summer Stanford University repeated its 1944 experiment of inviting professional actors to assist in the summer quarter play productions. Aline MacMahon and Robert Duke of stage and screen were appointed artists-in-residence and they appeared in leading roles of a new play by Pearl Buck, *My Indian Family*, dramatized from the novel of the same name by Hilda Wernher. They were supported by a cast of Stanford students and faculty members. This was a pre-Broadway tryout of the play.

• • •

At the Ohio State University the summer production was *The Night of January 16th*, directed by Mrs. Joseph Blickle.

PROMOTIONS

John V. Neale became Chairman of the Department of Public Speaking at Dartmouth College on July 1, 1945. He succeeds George V. Bohman who had served the customary two two-year terms. Mr. Neale was on leave of absence during the July term and H. A. Bradley acted as chairman.

• • •

Charles E. Weniger, Chairman of the Department of English and Speech, Pacific Union College, has been appointed Dean of the Undergraduate Division of that institution. He will continue to teach courses in speech.

• • •

H. Donald Winbigler of the Department of Speech and Drama in Stanford University has been elected Registrar of the University. Mr. Winbigler hopes to continue some teaching in speech.

• • •

Alan Nichols has been made Head of the Department of Speech in the University of Southern California, succeeding the late Ray K. Immel.

DEATHS

Elsie Fogerty, prominent teacher of speech and speech correction, died in Lemington, England on July 7 at the age of seventy-nine. In addition to her assistance to such stars as John Gielgud, Sybil Thorndike, Laurence Olivier, and Edith Evans, she also persuaded London University to grant a diploma for dramatic art—the first time the stage had been raised to university status.

• • •

The death of Elmer Lawton Kenyon marks the passing of one of the earliest pioneers in the field of disorders of voice and speech in the United States. In 1903 he left his general practice to specialize in otolaryngology and in 1910 established the second speech clinic in the United States at Rush Medical College. He was one of the founders of the American Society for the Study of Disorders of Speech (now the American Speech Correction Association). Dr. Kenyon had retired from Rush in 1937 with the rank of Emeritus Associate Professor.

• • •

Thomas A. Knott died on August 16 in the University Hospital at Ann Arbor, Michigan. He was editor of the *Middle English Dictionary* from 1926-1935, general editor of *Webster's New International* and *Collegiate Dictionaries*, and co-author of *A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English*. He had joined the Michigan faculty in 1935.

• • •

Word has just been received of the sudden death on June 16 of Harry B. Gough following an operation in a Chicago hospital. Mr. Gough had been teaching for the past year at Albion College.

AMONG THE CONTRIBUTORS

GIRAUD CHESTER: *Contemporary Senate Debate* (A.B., Brooklyn College; A.M., Wisconsin) holds the post of War Orientation Officer of the 14th Naval District. Before entering the Navy, Lt. Chester was a radio announcer and newscaster at Madison, Wisconsin. His article marks his first contribution to the JOURNAL.

DONALD C. BRYANT: *The Earl of Chesterfield's Advice on Speaking* (A.B., A.M., Ph.D., Cornell) is Associate Professor of English in charge of instruction in speech at Washington University, Saint Louis. In the field of eighteenth-century rhetoric and literature he has published many articles in this and other journals. His special interest in Edmund Burke is in part shown by his book, *Edmund Burke and His Literary Friends* (1939). He is the editor of a collection of papers on rhetoric by ASSOCIATION members and has recently enlarged his manual on the *Essentials of Oral Communication*. Most readers know that Mr. Bryant is a member of the ASSOCIATION'S Executive Council and is an Associate Editor of the JOURNAL.

CARL B. CONE: *Speech Training and Scholarship* (A.B., A.M., Ph.D., Iowa) is Assistant Professor of English History at Louisiana State University. He has been an instructor in history at Allegheny College as well as a research assistant for the Iowa State Historical Society. His long term interest is Edmund Burke, although he is now preparing a book dealing with Peter Koch of Montana. His writings, on a variety of subjects, have appeared in such publications as the *Palimpsest*, the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics*, and the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*. Mr. Cone is preparing for the JOURNAL an article on the rhetorical methods of writers of history.

WAYNE N. THOMPSON: *A Case Study of Dewey's Minneapolis Speech* (B.Ed., Western Illinois State Teachers College; A.M., Ph.D., Northwestern) is Assistant Professor of Speech at the University of Missouri, recently returning to that institution from Bowling Green (Ohio) University. He has held teaching positions at American University, Western Illinois Teachers, University of Missouri, and Northwestern. JOURNAL readers will recall his previous contribution to this publication in the field of discussion and debate. His articles have also appeared in *Speech Monographs*, the *Debate Handbook*, *Forensic*, *English Journal*, and other periodicals.

W. A. DAHLBERG: *Lincoln the Wit* (A.B., Michigan; A.M., Northwestern) is Professor of Speech and Drama and Director of the Division of Speech and Dramatic Arts at the University of Oregon. He has had experience as a high-school principal in Michigan, and as an instructor in Speech at Northwestern. This is Mr. Dahlberg's first contribution to the JOURNAL.

LAWRENCE H. MOUAT: *The Illustrated Speech* (A.B., A.M., Stanford; Ph.D., Cornell) is Personnel Administrator at the San Bernardino Air Technical Service Command, California. Under the same command he has also held the position of Supervisor of Course Material. Mr. Mouat has formerly taught speech at Stanford University, Occidental College, and Cornell University.

ELIZABETH G. MCPHERSON: *Major Publications of Gales and Seaton* (A.B., Oxford College; A.B., A.M., Ph.D., University of North Carolina) is Librarian of the Manuscripts Division of the Library of Congress. Before joining the staff of the Library of Congress in 1934, Miss McPherson taught history in the schools of North Carolina and was also for a period Head of the Department of History at Martha Washington College. Her present article represents a continuation of her reports for the QUARTERLY JOURNAL on the sources of the early debates in Congress. Miss McPherson's articles have also appeared in the *North Carolina Historical Review* and the *William and Mary Quarterly*.

FLORA RHETA SCHREIBER: *Radio as Arthur Hopkins Presents It* (A.B., A.M., Columbia) is at present a member of the Department of Speech in charge of Radio at Brooklyn College. Miss Schreiber has held the Cornelia Otis Skinner Scholarship awarded by the Drama League of America for study at the University of London. While in England, she

taught at Exeter College in the University of the Southwest, and was assistant director of a Stratford-on-Avon production of *All's Well That Ends Well.* Frequent writing assignments for NBC have kept her in close touch with radio. Almost constant association with the production of most of the plays described in her article gave her first-hand observation of the materials that form the basis of her article. She has written for a variety of newspapers and magazines.

WILLIAM G. MCCOLLOM: *Formalism and Illusion in Shakespearian Drama* (A.B., A.M., Ph.D., Cornell University) is Assistant Professor of English and Drama at Western Reserve University. Especially interested in the theory of the drama, Mr. McCollom hopes before long to publish a book on the nature of the tragic experience in Elizabethan times. He has taught at Cornell University and at the University of Maryland.

HELMUTH HÖRMANN: *Ludwig Tieck, Theatrical Reformer* (A.B., A.M., Hawaii; Ph.D., Cornell University) has been for the past three years a civil employee of the United States Engineers on a camouflage project in Hawaii. His former experience includes work in play direction in the Schauspielschule des Deutschen Theaters in Berlin and as a teacher of art and drama in the schools of Hawaii and in the Honolulu Academy of Arts.

SARA LOWREY: *Interpretative Reading as an Aid to Speech Correction, Acting, and Radio* (A.M., Baylor University) is Professor of Speech and Chairman of the Department of Speech at Baylor University. For many years Miss Lowrey has taught oral interpretation and has been supervisor of training in radio at Baylor. A former contributor to the JOURNAL, she has also written articles for *Player's Magazine.* In 1928 she produced her book on *Constructive Critique for Oral Interpretation* and in 1941, in collaboration with Gertrude E. Johnson, she published *Interpretative Reading.*

MOIREE COMPERE: *Speech: Science and/or Art* (A.B., B.O., Quachita College; A.M., Chicago) is an instructor of oral interpretation in the Department of Speech at Michigan State College. For six years, Mrs. Compere has been in charge of the speech work of the New York University summer session at Chautauqua and has read and lectured for the Chautauqua institution. For four years she has been educational director of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union. Mrs. Compere writes that she is preparing a book of materials for oral interpretation and that she is undertaking a special reading clinic where she will use oral reading methods as part of the remedial procedures.

STANLEY H. AINSWORTH: *Suggestions for a Successful Speech Correction Program in Public Schools* (A.B., Michigan State Normal College; A.M., State University of Iowa) is Clinical Supervisor of Speech Correction in the Special Education Clinics at Indiana State Teachers College. In addition to public school teaching positions in speech correction and English, he formerly held the position of Instructor in Speech Re-education at Northwestern University. Although this is his first contribution to the JOURNAL, he is well known in the field of speech correction through his articles in the *Journal of Speech Disorders* and in the *Journal of Exceptional Children.* His book, *Galloping Sounds,* is to be published this year.

JESSE J. VILLARREAL: *The Semantic Aspects of Stuttering in Non-Stutterers* (A.B., A.M., Texas) is Assistant Professor of Speech and Director of the Speech Laboratory at the University of Texas. He is a former contributor to the JOURNAL and his most recent article appeared in the April issue. His special interests at present lie in two areas, speech correction and the teaching of English as a second language; and in this second area he is now working on a recorded oral comprehension test of English.

EDWARD STASHEFF: *High-School Dramatics and Television* (A.B., A.M., Columbia) holds positions in the Program Department of Station WNYE, in the Department of Speech at Brooklyn Technical High School, and in the teaching of radio and television broadcasting in the City-Wide Classes of New York. He has been Stage Manager and Director of the summer theatres at Provincetown, Massachusetts and Roxbury, Connecticut, and has been Chairman of the Department of Speech at Christopher Columbus High School in New York City. Although this is Mr. Stasheff's first appearance in the QUARTERLY JOURNAL, he published in 1934, *Shakespeare's Nights,* and in 1942 edited and adapted W. S. Gilbert's *Creatures of Impulse.* Besides his other activities, Mr. Stasheff is preparing a high school textbook on radio and is about to undertake television programming for the New York City Board of Education.

RALPH C. LEYDEN: *A Course in Speech*

Training for Business (A.B., Macalester College, A.M., Minnesota) is a teacher of speech and communication at Stephens College. Mr. Leyden has taught speech in the high schools of Minnesota, has been associated with the extension service of the University of Minnesota, and for two years was president of the Minnesota Association of Teachers of Speech. In addition to his teaching duties at Stephens, he is doing graduate study at the University of Missouri.

GUSTAVE SCHWAMM: *The Teacher's Voice: Show-Window of Personality* (B.S., A.M., J.D., New York University) is an Assistant Professor in the School of Business at Russell Sage College. Although this is his first contribution to the JOURNAL, he has published extensively in the *Journal of Education, Progressive Education, Business Education, Music Teacher's Quarterly,* and *Educational Screen.*